THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CLXXXVIII.] AUGUST, 1860. [Vol. XVI.

ADDRESS TO THE STUDENTS OF MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE, LONDON, DELIVERED AFTER THE ANNUAL EXAMINATION, ON JUNE 27, 1860, BY THE REV. WILLIAM GASKELL, M.A., AS ONE OF THE VISITORS.

Gentlemen,—At the close of an Examination such as we have just gone through, I feel that you can scarcely be in a condition to attend to aught in the shape of a formal dissertation, and I should be going beyond my sphere, if I were to single out for remark any of the studies that are carried on here, and which, as you have proved, are in excellent hands. But I may hope that you will listen to me while I offer a few suggestions respecting the position which you are destined to occupy, looking at it from the vantage-ground of a wider experience than your own. On this alone rests my claim to address you. Having dwelt as yet, for the most part, in "a calm and pleasing solitariness, fed with cheerful and confident thoughts"—"beholding the bright countenance of truth in the quiet and still air of delightful studies"—you cannot see so clearly what awaits you, when you come "to embark in a troubled sea of noises and hoarse disputes," as those who have long been tossed upon it, and cannot, therefore, know so well what are the requisites for a safe and successful voyage over it.

First of all, let me say, distinctly and emphatically, that you will not do yourselves justice, nor the cause which you are to serve, if you yield in any wise to the feeling sometimes expressed, which would lower the demand for true scholarship amongst us. There is, I grant, a field of labour now opening to us that may not call for the same high mental culture as those in which we have hitherto been mainly engaged—though even in it, I am persuaded, if there be the right spirit, such culture will be found not a hindrance but a help, "not waste but a good work;" but it is the special duty of another Institution to send forth labourers into that field, as it is of this to prepare you for one where more extensive learning and varied accomplishments are needed. Not to dwell on the obvious gain to yourselves, and the increased power of influencing others for good, which knowledge will be sure to confer, if it is used to mature your judgment and reflection, and make you not merely learned men but men improved

by learning—you will frequently be placed in circumstances where you will be glad that you are able to summon this directly to your aid. For example, you will find that questions are now exciting an interest, and freely discussed, among our thoughtful laity, which demand no slight and superficial acquaintance with theology on the part of those who would take up and maintain a clear, independent position with regard to them. The deference once paid to professional assertions is gone, and if you would be listened to now, it must be for the reasons you bring. You will sometimes feel a dark and heavy atmosphere of doubt around you, and at other times the thick and stifling mists of educated superstition, which nothing but the vivid flashes of a piercing intelligence can dissipate. And occasionally you will be brought in contact with a subtle and refined scepticism which, in its attacks on faith, substitutes, for the old method of direct assault, the more dangerous one of sap and mine, and which it needs all the resources of moral and religious truth to encounter. In these, and such-like cases, those to whom you stand in the relation of teachers will naturally, and justly, expect that you should be prepared to furnish them with information and opinions on which they may rely, and help them to keep the strength of their souls intact.—You know little, either, of what is taking place in other Churches—of the kind of questions which are agitating them, and the changes they are undergoing—if you do not perceive how necessary it is, unless we are content to lose the post of honour which we have hitherto held in the vanguard of a free theology, that those who are to lead our ranks should be men cased in the armour of proof and equipped with the high-tempered weapons which generous scholarship supplies. It is because we have had such leaders that our little band has exerted, and is still exerting, an influence so confessedly beyond what its numbers would have entitled it to expect. Be worthy to tread in the steps of those leaders, and "guard the laurels that descend to you." It is too likely that cases will arise in which you may be called upon, as they have been, by your allegiance to sacred truth, to withstand the pretensions of High-Church authority, or expose the mistakes of Dissenting infallibility (such as that which lately gave to the mediæval doctrine of justification by faith the prestige of antiquity, from confounding the Confession of Augsburg with the Confessions of Augustine), and where, without the aids and appliances of learning, you may disgrace the cause which you have to defend. If you are not able to compete, in nicety of classical knowledge or extent of mathematical attainments, with those who "walk the studious cloisters pale" on the banks of the Isis and the Cam, you may, I am convinced, make yourselves masters of what is really important in their acquisitions, and at the same time surpass the generality in such subjects as biblical criticism and interpretation, the history of

the Church and its doctrines, the philosophy of human nature and its connection with religion. You have one advantage here which is often denied to other students,—you can pursue your inquiries with perfect freedom, unchecked by any irreligious fear that true science can ever reveal aught the least at variance with God's true word.—Imagine not, then, though you may be unable yet to see clearly its use, that you can dispense with any part of the discipline provided for you here. Do you who are still passing through it, strive to make the very utmost of it. Seek to form your minds at once to those patient and discriminating habits of thought, which will soon be needed in actual service, to separate the wheat from the chaff, the true from the false; and "give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine, that your profiting may appear to all." And do not you, who are now going from under the special control and supervision of others to play your individual part in the world, think for a moment that your studies are at an end, but only feel that from this time forth you are made responsible to yourselves for your improvement, and that by your own efforts the mental habits in which you have been trained must be continued, and your mental wants be supplied. Labour still to extend and brighten your knowledge, to enrich and ennoble your minds, and shew yourselves more and more "workmen that need not to be ashamed."

Let me say a word, next, on the call which you will find for definite views of Christian doctrine. Many may over-estimate the importance of this, but others, to my apprehension, underestimate it. The way in which some speak of opinions, as though all were of about the same value and entitled to the same reverence, indicates, to my mind, the want of a lively regard for any. It is pretty much as if a physician were to deem it of no consequence whether the ingredients of his medicines were pure or adulterated. You cannot, I am convinced, divorce practical wisdom altogether from speculative truth. An idea, before now, has moulded a life. The views which a man takes of God, in proportion as they are sincere, must have a formative influence on his character. If in the highest object of his reverence he sees a stern, pitiless, vengeful taskmaster, you can hardly expect that he himself will be found mild, gentle and easy-to-be-entreated. I have had distinct proof, too, in my own experience, how deleterious the effects may be of a faith which has not reason and conscience for its kin, both in bewildering the mind and perverting the heart; and I am likewise persuaded, that to this source may be traced no small amount of the scepticism which lies smouldering in the bosom of society. In a matter, therefore, of such importance as I cannot but regard this, it seems to me most desirable that, before you come out into the world, you should try to attain to something like clear and satisfactory conclusions concerning the great doctrines of Christian faith, so

that you may not be perpetually see-sawing between two sets of opinions. I am not recommending you to *make up* your minds, in anything like a narrow and contracted spirit, leaving no openings for new truth to enter. Far from it. Be ready always to welcome this, let it break from whatever quarter it may. Look for daily light, as you look for daily bread. Correct, and brighten, and enlarge your views by constant study. Interrogate nature, providence, revelation—interrogate philosophy, literature, science—interrogate every oracle by which the responses of a present Deity may be obtained; but be not "ever learning, and never coming to a knowledge of the truth." Surely, it is possible to have definite opinions, without reducing them to a petrifaction—steady convictions, without resisting all change. One of your duties is to be "the manifestation of the truth;" but how can you manifest that which you do not possess? If the light trembles and is confused in your own mind, how can you hope to reflect it clearly into the minds of others? You are to "prove all things," no doubt; but there is a "good" which you are to "hold fast," if you would offer it to your fellow-men. You cannot reach, it is true, that unerring certainty which will qualify you to become authorities before which they are to bow; but you may arrive at conclusions that are satisfactory to yourselves, and which, in a spirit of meekness and love, you may recommend to them. The most earnest faith need never lessen, in the slightest degree, either your humility or your charity.—From our having no creed, an impression widely prevails that we have no clear and settled belief. An unfriendly critic attributes to this cause what he supposes to be our declining state and want of influence. "Its simplicity," he says, "might give Unitarian preaching a great advantage, but its vagueness and unfixedness ever has been, and must always be, its ruin." *Fas est et ab hoste doceri.* If too much ground may have been afforded for his "ever has been," I see none for his "must always be." Why should not you have your definite convictions—your truth—as well as other men; and why should not you be equally faithful in bearing witness to it?

Again; let me say it is of the utmost importance that you should maintain a deep sense of the real greatness of your work. This will be a powerful stimulus to you in preparing for it, and a needful support in carrying it on. It is to be your business to speak to your fellow-men on the highest themes which can claim their attention—to minister to their spiritual wants—to bring order out of disorder, change vice into virtue, sin into holiness—to feed and nurture those diviner elements of the soul which enable it to conquer the worst evils of life, and triumph over death, and raise it to a companionship with the angels of God. If you do not feel how much nobler a thing it is to be labouring truly in a work like this—the work of the Saviour—

than to be most successfully engaged in heaping up riches, or securing any of the ordinary objects of ambition—I must honestly tell you, you have mistaken your vocation; you have no call to your calling; you will fail, and deserve to fail. This, I know, is the feeling sought to be cherished in you here. The true standard is kept before you. But when you come forth to your actual work, you will find things tried by a very different one. You will have to mix with men to whom wealth is one of the highest powers, and who treat the interests with which you have to do as trifling and unreal, compared with those in which they are engaged. And there is a danger to you in this, against which you must be upon your guard. The breath they breathe may dim your true ideal. You may let yourselves, almost unconsciously, be warped by the influences around you, and the false glitter of the earthly mammon dull your sense of the incomparable brightness of the treasure in heaven, and the small hopes and fears which gather round the perishing obscure to you the grandeur of those which belong to the eternal. In this case, your work will not be true work. There will be an element of weakness in it; and it may become only poor, heartless, irksome task-work. You will not respect it yourselves, and how can you hope that it will be respected by others? But if you keep before you what the real nature of your ministry is—that it is yours to confer something better than food, or money, or health, or knowledge—yours to make everlasting impressions for good; and, at the same time, cherish the faith that God is with you as He was with the prophets and apostles of earlier times, and with the saints and martyrs of later days, as interested in your work as He was in theirs, and as ready to strengthen and uphold you in it,—then you will run no risk of proving faithless to it. Your soul will keep its state in a calm, clear region, whence it can look forth and see things in something like their true proportions, and the mere pomp and pageantry of this transient life will fade away into their actual insignificance.—This is a point to which I attach no slight importance. Make it your fixed and settled faith—let there be no flaw of doubt in it—that grander and nobler work than that which you have chosen, earth has, and can have, none. Begin at once to mould your lives by this faith, and let your souls become so pervaded with it that its influence may be felt, animating and quickening you, in all that you do. This will not render you vain and conceited. You need not despise other men's work, because you honour your own. You may magnify your office, without magnifying yourselves. Nay, the very sense of its greatness—while inspiring you with calm courage and generous devotion, and schooling you to patient labour and cheerful self-sacrifice—will tend to keep you humble. You will feel how little able you are to rise to the height of it, and be made anxious to become more and more equal to it.

Such a sense will lead, almost of necessity, to earnestness in your pulpit ministrations; but this is a requisite so important that I cannot pass it by without distinct notice. The call for it may have degenerated into something like cant, but there is a reality at the bottom of it which is worth attending to. Apathy and indifference, you may be perfectly sure, win no triumphs here, any more than anywhere else. In no case is the rule of effective oratory so true as in this,—if you would move others, you must first be moved yourself; speak not because you must say something, but because you have something to say. It is yours to offer the word of life to the souls that are under your care, but if it is a dead word to your own souls, you will never offer it in such a way as to quicken and vivify theirs. Men soon detect, by a sort of instinct, the difference between him who speaks because he has a post to fill, a party to serve, a living to gain, and him who speaks because he has a conviction to utter, a truth to impart. The former may have the art to dress up his discourse with tact and skill, but all his power will only make it flash with the cold light that "plays round the head, but comes not to the heart;" while the latter, with far less ability perchance, will be sure to find a response there, because what he says springs out of the intensity of feeling in his own. This has been the case with all who have mightily moved others. It was so with the first preachers of Christianity; and, as far as human agency went, this was the great secret of their success. They were thoroughly convinced themselves, and therefore they convinced others. They were altogether in earnest, and therefore they made a deep impression on the world. They spoke with the tone and authority of faith, and therefore men listened with the deference of disciples. They could say without any hesitation, "We believe, and therefore speak."—It was so with the great leaders of the Reformation. They spoke with such marvellous effect, because they had so fervently embraced their object.—It was so with Whitfield and Wesley. They felt that they were called to do a great work in the revival of the religious life, more especially among the poor and world-neglected. They gave themselves to it, heart and soul. And we know the result. The ignorant were roused to consideration, the profligate reclaimed to virtue, the brutal and besotted won over to piety and goodness.—And so will it be with you. Speak with the force of living conviction—because there is a burden on your souls which you must discharge, a message of God which you must deliver—and then you will find what has been done in the past may be done in the present. If you have that kindling earnestness which is born of clear faith in great principles, success must be yours. Spirit will call unto spirit in tones which it cannot resist, and men be forced to bear witness to the moving words that proceed out of your mouth. You may, it is true, be without some helps

which other preachers possess. You will have none of the artificial sanctity of a priesthood to impart influence to your teaching. You will not be able to make any pretensions to apostolical succession, in order to lend authority to what you say. You will have no cloak of church infallibility to throw over your deficiencies. You must carry your commission in your fitness for your work. It must be the weight of your own character which gives you weight. But you have one great advantage above many. You will have no burden of subscription to articles on your conscience, to tempt you to insincerity. You will not be forced to adjust your convictions to some old traditional creed, from which the life has long since departed. It will be your privilege, and esteem it not lightly, to speak out of the fulness of your own mind and heart the things pertaining to man's deepest wants. You will not be obliged to pass your truth through the channels which church authorities approve, and cautiously serve it out in the standard measures which they supply; but you will be free to present it drawn straight from those freshly-springing fountains which God has opened, according to every one's need.

In doing this, there is one point which, I am sure, deserves your attention. If you are to act on men's characters—to make them love virtue and loathe vice, be true and noble instead of false and mean, generous Christians instead of selfish worldlings —you must be able to move them deeply, and this can be done only through their emotional nature. Mere reasoning will never do it. The feelings and sympathies must be engaged; the heart go along with the head. It is the fervent call of the prophet spirit, and not the cold voice of instruction, which rouses men from their slumbers, and kindles them to high action, and braces them up for brave endurance. This is a consideration which, it seems to me, we have too much lost sight of. We can lay claim to minds of wide research, and great intelligence and refinement; but where shall we look for the tenderness that melts and sways the heart at will; where for the eloquence that carries the soul along with it; where for the thunderbolts that transfix the guilty; where for the influence that descends as softly as dew, as silently as light, and as transforming and efficacious? Let us be honest; —have not the sensibilities been too little cultivated amongst us, the heroic elements been too much overlooked? Has not too exclusive attention been paid to the intellect; and have not the capabilities of our principles for impression been undervalued? It is this, I believe, which has done much to alienate from us men of warm, poetic temperaments, and unfitted our views for popular sympathy and acceptance. An improvement in this respect is undoubtedly taking place, and the results are most encouraging.—As you wish, then, to influence men for good, see that the truths which you have to offer them are not suffered to dwindle into logical forms, or intellectual abstractions, or meta-

physical speculations; but bring them forth steeped in the vital warmth of your own inmost heart. You may not, perchance, have the vivid nature which forms the orator almost without effort; but you may have, and should have, the fervour of feeling which naturally runs into poetic expression, and pours itself forth in words of strong and stirring meaning, and which will go far to render you eloquent.

One other point briefly, and I have done. I am inclined to think that there has scarcely been sufficient freedom in our public ministrations, and that we might take a lesson from the first promulgators of Christianity. Preaching was not then the formal thing it has since become, but, as you know, a free and diversified agency. Sometimes in the market-place, sometimes in the private dwelling, or any place that offered, the gospel was preached. And the manner was equally varied. The early preachers endeavoured to be all things to all men, so that they might by all means save some. The methods of Christian influence had not then hardened into unbending forms, but there was an elasticity about them which contrasts strongly with our own rigid modes. And I much doubt whether the gain is with us. I have no wish that the pulpit should be deprived of its fitting solemnity, but we must see that this becomes not devout dulness, and that the end is not sacrificed to the means. The object to be aimed at is to render religion attractive, interesting and impressive; and there is one method of doing this which, I am convinced, we have not yet sufficiently turned to account. We must all have felt the advantage, in keeping up attention and reaching the heart, which is possessed over a written discourse by a forcible, feeling extempore address; and if so, why should not we, as well as other denominations, avail ourselves of this form of preaching? I can only say, if my own course had to come over again, I would cultivate it with the most sedulous care. There need be in it no slovenliness, no want of thought, or accuracy, or arrangement; and, as experience shews, it may be the means of interesting those with whom the ordinary method very often fails. Is it not desirable, then, that you should acquire a readiness in this way of giving utterance to your thoughts? Many are the occasions now which call for it, and in which you will find your power of usefulness lessened by the want of it; and these will increase with the extension of the missionary spirit which has recently manifested itself amongst us, and which, in my opinion, promises most important results.

The remarks which I now bring to a close are somewhat desultory and unconnected, I know. I care not for that, if they only lead you to contemplate at all more steadily the work which is before you, and to see at all more clearly what are the demands which it will make upon you. As you may easily suppose, we who are soon to quit the stage cannot but look with no little

interest and anxiety on you, into whose hands we are about to commit the cause which we have laboured for and loved, and on whose fidelity its future success must needs so greatly depend. We believe that it demands, and deserves, the consecration to it of an undivided heart and undivided life. If you do not feel this, and are not prepared to devote to it every power and every energy which God has given you, you are not worthy of it. If you do feel this, and are ready to spend and be spent in its service—to work honestly and faithfully for its promotion, earnest yet not hasty, resolute yet not rash, calm yet not indolent, hopeful yet not impatient, watching and waiting day by day for the calls which it makes upon you—then your reward is sure; you will find your hands continually growing stronger, and difficulties giving way before you, and have many witnesses to your success here, and a higher witness above.

SEA WEEDS.

BY R. E. B. MACLELLAN.

From hedge-row green we do not come,
Or shadowy wood, or sunny lea,
Or breezy hill,—but have our home
Far down beneath the dark blue sea.
Cradled by wind and rocked by storm,
Yet grace and beauty both are ours;
Nor yield we, in our hue or form,
E'en to the proud earth's fairest flowers.

Ours are the ocean's forests vast,
And ours the ocean's gardens fair,
Where pearls are 'mid the foliage cast,
And living creatures bright and rare
Through all our shelly caverns roam,
Or sink amid our bowers to rest,
And feel within their briny home
That not the land alone is blest.

No gloom pervades our dwelling-place,
For moon and star they both shine clear,
But with a soft and chastened grace,
Down through our wavy atmosphere.
But most the great sun's mighty glow
Does all our depths with gladness fill:
Our humblest homes are not so low,
But Heaven's bright smile can reach them still!

NEGLECTED BIOGRAPHY. No. I.

SOME ACCOUNT OF THE WRITINGS, CORRESPONDENCE AND PERSECUTION OF REV. SAMUEL BOLD, RECTOR OF STEEPLE, IN THE COUNTY OF DORSET.

If any one, properly qualified for the difficult task, were to compile a volume of "Neglected Biography," the life of Samuel Bold, a defender and personal friend of John Locke, and the able and fearless champion of religious liberty at a time when its enemies were numerous and unsparing, would probably find a place therein. Having searched in vain for any particular account of this excellent clergyman, we have been induced to put together such particulars of his life and writings as, after a careful search in some of the principal libraries of Oxford and London, we have been able to glean concerning him, in the hope of interesting at least a portion of our readers, and rescuing from forgetfulness the memory of a man of more than common worth and talent. If, notwithstanding some pains in the search, our narrative seems scanty, the facts that the subject of our memoir outlived all his early contemporaries, and that nearly a century and a quarter have elapsed since his death, must serve as our apology.

Samuel Bold was born in the year 1649, in or near the ancient city of Chester. Of his parents nothing is known; but it is probable that he was at a very early period of life deprived of them, for he gratefully acknowledges in the preface of one of his books* generally the "great love" shewn to him by his friends in the city of Chester from his infancy upwards, and more particularly the "motherly affection, care and tenderness" manifested towards him through "childhood and youth" by one Christian lady residing in that city.

Among the worthies of Chester, none shewed greater religiousness of spirit or more disinterested charity than William Cooke, the ejected minister of St. Michael, and one of the chief founders of that Protestant Nonconformity which was subsequently adorned by Matthew Henry and others. The description which Baxter and Calamy give of him sets before us a Puritan "of the primitive stamp," "who could go in poor clothing, live on a little, travel on foot," and preach and pray all the week through, when and where he could get a few to hear him. This good man and his wife, having no family, were accustomed to adopt children, providing for them food, lodging, raiment, and, above all, careful and systematic instruction in religion and human learning, fitting them for the ministry. Samuel Bold was one of those thus trained. Mr. Cooke was an accomplished oriental scholar, and known as such to Bishop Walton, the editor of the Polyglot Bible, who, if he could, would have gladly induced him

* "Man's Great Duty," London, 12mo, 1693.

to conform. Mr. Bold was with him, probably, in the relations of adopted son and pupil at the time of his ejectment, and when, shortly after, at the instigation of Bishop Hall, he was thrown into prison by the mayor for preaching in his own house. This incident would teach him the hideous character of religious persecution. Harshly as Mr. Cooke was treated, he continued to exhibit a catholic spirit, which would contrast all the more with the uncharitableness which made him a sufferer. "He managed his dissent from Conformists with that candour and Christian temper, he highly deserved love and respect from all Conformists who were endowed with true piety, or indeed had any share of common ingenuity. He did not abuse his Dissent to uncharitableness and censure; nay, he could not endure to hear a deserving Conformist reflected on."

Through what influences or by what means Mr. Bold sought and obtained ordination, we are not informed. Together with the other members of the family of Mr. Cooke, he was accustomed always to attend the services of the Church. Possibly through the influence and aid of Bishop Wilkins (whose forbearance and mildness sapped the Nonconformity of several in the diocese of Chester), he might receive ordination as a priest of the Established Church. The first preferment with which we find his name connected was the vicarage of Shapwick, in the county of Dorset. He was instituted to this benefice, returned in 1650 as yielding £80 per annum, in 1674, when he was thirty years of age. Here his duties were confined to a small and simple flock; but he was earnest in his efforts to instruct and improve them. It was his custom to preach every Sunday on the prescribed Epistle for the day, either as a whole or on some chosen part of it. In March 1682, he was called upon to read the brief in behalf of the persecuted Protestants in France. The Epistle appointed for the day (March 26) was Gal. iv. Finding in that chapter the words, "But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the spirit, even so it is now," he selected them as a text and preached from them a sermon against Persecution. He was entitled to say that he discoursed on his text "with a freedom which becomes a Christian, and particularly a true son of the Church of England." He spoke of the repulsive and abominable characteristics of persecution and its abettors with equal plainness and force. Here is a passage:

"Christ and religion do not allow of persecutions, of troubling and vexing, of ruining and undoing any man for little indifferences, much less for truth and holyness. They are for advancing and propagating holyness, and peace, and love, and condescension. Christ came not to destroy but to save men's lives, and sharply rebukes his disciples when they would have call'd for fire from heaven to destroy the Samaritans. It is a sure token men are enemies to Christ and religion when they are

of a persecuting spirit. It hath always been the great character and glory of the Christian religion, that where ever it came it did promote and further quietness, and peace, and love, and brotherly kindness; and did banish wrath, and fury, and malice, and every hateful and hurtful disposition and inclination. It was always thus, till Popery got some power in the world, and then more barbarous villanies and outragious cruelties were perpetrated under this name than were known to the world before. And if it be carefully observed, you shall find that in all ages those who have been most for cruel methods against them that differ from them, have had most of the spirit of Popery in them; and it is deplorably apparent that now in our days they who appear most vigorous and active in prosecuting those Protestants who differ from others in some accidental matters, have a great affection for Popery, and are hastening towards Rome as fast as they can."

The portrait which Mr. Bold draws of the men by whose agency the persecuting laws of those evil days were enforced, would seem a caricature, did not the lives of some of the sufferers which have come down to us confirm his accuracy.

"They that never scruple to tear the name of God in pieces, and to affront their Maker on every turn by taking his name in vain, who emboss every word they speak with some dreadful oath or other, who dare impudently swear a hundred oaths in an hour, without any provocation,—these are the fittest men to inform and swear against, and indeavour their ruine, who have a religious and truly conscientious regard to the name of God, and every thing on which he hath stampt his image."

In describing the evil influences which have inflamed persecution, Mr. Bold mentions unjust prejudices, eagerly imbibed and fondly entertained; and he chastises with his equal censure Churchmen and Dissenters who had "disported themselves" into excessive wrath and mutual enmity. Thus does Mr. Bold expose the inconsistency of the Popish party in the Church in their behaviour to the Church of Rome and their treatment of Nonconformists:

"How ridiculous and absurd is it, to hear men talk very gravely at sometimes, that the Church hath no weapons but tears and prayers, and yet presently to see the same men using rods, and swords, and axes, in the Church's behalf! When the Church is in danger of being clouded, eclypsed, and overcome, and suppress by Popery, then it is unlawful to endeavour to help our selves; we must only lie prostrate, and try if we can wash away our sorrow with our tears, or at most content our selves with, *Lord, help us!* But when we consider them we have got an ascendancy over, it becomes glorious (and indeed is more than Christian) to swagger and triumph, and tread upon men of the same religion with our selves, only because they differ from us in some unhappy circumstances.

"When the Church doth stand upon its proper basis, and shines in its native beauty and lustre, there will be no *hurting in God's holy mountain.*

"That method which hath most of lenity, forbearance, love, and meekness, doth best comport with the nature and design of Christianity, and

most answers that temper our Saviour and his apostles commended to the world both by their practices and precepts. Luke ix. 55; 2 Tim. ii. 24."

Applying his general principles of toleration and forbearance to the then state of parties in England, and referring to a pacific and healing resolution passed by the House of Commons, Jan. 10, 1680, which he pronounces consonant with the declaration of the King at Breda, he says,

"The prosecution of these laws hath been declared inconvenient and hurtful to the Protestant religion, by them who understand the nature, the tendency, and the obligation of these laws, as well or better than any of the violent and outragious prosecutors of them. And tho' this cannot repeal or make null the laws, yet the publick opinion of so great, honourable, and august an assembly, should have so much influence as to check the inordinate zeal some are too apt to lay out in their unnecessary informations and presentments."

Could the impolicy of persecution as a means of conversion be better shewn than in these words?

"Suppose you should force many to come within the door of our churches by harsh and severe proceedings, what is our Church the better for this? Can you, together with outward compulsion, infuse into their minds an affectionate love to, and unfeigned approbation of our service and worship? If not, you may make our Church fuller of hypocrites than she was before, but not fuller of real and cordial proselytes; you may turn the places for our publick worship into prisons, if you please, but you cannot by these means make the Dissenters *a willing people in the day of your power.*

"The members of the Church must be volunteers, and not press'd men. Such as are forced will never do acceptable service: they will embrace the first opportunity to relinquish and bespatter us."

To preach a sermon like this was a bold act at a time when, as Lord Macaulay has expressed it, "a series of odious acts" had been passed by Parliament; when the magistrates by whom these rigorous statutes were to be enforced were in general men inflamed by party spirit; and when the gaols were filled with Dissenters, and "among the sufferers were some of whose genius and virtue any Christian society might well be proud." But to publish such a sermon was to declare war against the hierarchy of the day, and to expose himself to the bitter anger of his neighbours of the rural clergy, a class of men "more vehement in Toryism than the rural gentry." The mere preaching of such a sermon to the few peasants of Dorsetshire accustomed to assemble themselves in the parish church of Shapwick, roused many "false reports." The preacher vainly thought he could by its publication check the excitement and call "violent and headstrong men" to "consideration." The Address to the Reader with which it was ushered in to the world did not mend matters. Imagine the indignation of rural squires and clergymen over their tankards of ale when they read this tribute to the character of Dissenters!

"Those of the Dissenters whom I have been acquainted with have been men of great learning, exemplary piety, strict devotion, and extraordinary loyalty. Men who have been diligent attenders on God in his publick ordinances, eminently religious in their families, who have had a great regard to conscience in all the parts of their conversation with men. . . . . They have been persons that could not be justly blamed for any thing, but that they had straighter notions concerning humane impositions in the service of God than we Conformists have."

It was an unfortunate circumstance for Mr. Bold that his ecclesiastical superior was Dr. William Gulston, the Bishop of Bristol, a man equally mean in character and talents; one who fawned on those above him and regained his self-respect by severity against those beneath him; who affected an inordinate zeal for his Church, which his actions belied, and who, giving out his intention of permanently enriching the see of Bristol by endowing it with his family living of Symondsbury (near Bridport), was enabled to hold his rectory after his elevation to the episcopal bench, and then failed to fulfil his part of the compact. In such a man there were all the elements needed to make an unflinching persecutor. There exist damning proofs against him in this particular in his own autograph letters to Archbishop Sheldon, which form part of the invaluable series of MSS. collected by Bishop Tanner and deposited in the Bodleian Library. We are not aware that these letters have ever been published, and we shall presently give extracts from them so far as they illustrate the history of Mr. Bold.

At the assizes held at Sherborne, Aug. 1682, the grand jury (at whose instigation we shall presently shew) expressed their desire that the King should be informed that the peace of the county was much secured by the vigorous enforcement of the penal laws against Popish recusants and all other Dissenters, and they then proceed upon the information of John Ouctalony, clerk, of Beer-Regis, to present Samuel Bold for the publication of a seditious pamphlet, entitled "A Sermon against Persecution," whereby the King's government was defamed. How Mr. Bold met this presentment and the indictment founded on it will be presently seen in his own words. Before he defended himself against the legal charge, he pleaded at the bar of public opinion in self-defence by the publication of a 4to pamphlet of 42 pages, entitled, "A Plea for Moderation towards Dissenters, occasioned by the Grand Juries presenting the Sermon against Persecution, &c. To which is added an Answer to the Objections commonly made against that Sermon."

One of the mottoes on the title-page is a passage from the Stratagems of Satan by Acontius *(Qui pacem et concordiam in Ecclesiâ vult esse, oportet eum rerum necessariarum confessione contentum esse)*, which indicates the author's desire to limit the confession and creed of his Church to matters absolutely neces-

sary. He accordingly argues in the outset, that to force others to comply in the use of needless rites by resorting to penalties is the work, not of God, but of Satan (p. 3). He then proceeds to argue that moderation is the true policy and greatest safeguard of the Church of England. To shew the propriety of enforcing things indifferent on other men's consciences, he appeals to the conduct of the first preachers of Christianity. He pleads for moderation towards Dissenters on the authority of such men as Bishop Wilkins and Dr. Tillotson. The eulogium on the former is worthy of being extracted.

"It is very well known that Dr. Wilkins, late Bishop of Chester, was a man of as prodigious universal learning, and of as clear and solid a judgment, as any man the Christian world was ever adorned with; and it is as well known that he was equally famous for his moderation towards Dissenters before he was made Bishop, as for any of his other extraordinary accomplishments: and after he ascended the episcopal seat he continued the same man he was before, and made that diocess (as it is very well known there, and in most other places) the most flourishing and truly religious part (I think I may truly say) of all Christendom, by the happy influence, under Divine grace, his eminent moderation, zealous piety, and most Christian government had in those parts."

The question is argued from the beginning on large and general principles, and the author proceeds steadily to his conclusion by the approved and now all but universally recognized arguments for religious liberty, and against persecution in all forms and degrees. Referring to the opinion hostile to his sermon expressed by several of eminent places in the Church, he remarks, "For my own part, I do not much concern myself for that. With me it is a small thing to be judged of man's judgment. I am willing to pay every man the respect his particular place, character, office and quality can require. But I hope it is no fault for a man to wish and pray that the Church of England may never sink, perish—no, nor suffer, by the false and insidious tricks of some who pretend to her. 'Tis not the opposition of enemies on all hands that can do us so much hurt as the scandal and folly of pretending friends."*

The "Plea for Moderation" is throughout calm and able, and is probably the best of the various works written by its excellent author. The publication of it, instead of mitigating, increased the rancour of the author's enemies, and the "Plea" was, as well as the Sermon, made the groundwork of a prosecution in both the civil and ecclesiastical courts. But if Mr. Bold had his enemies, he was not without friends, and from one of them (Mr. William Churchill) he received, about the time of the hostile proceedings against him for his Sermon, institution to the rectory of Steeple, in the island of Purbeck, a living superior in

* Bishop Wilkins' Sermon, p. 162.

value to Shapwick. This, again, was a very thinly-peopled parish. The church, like that from which his early friend Mr. Cooke had been ejected, was dedicated to St. Michael. Of the legal proceedings against Mr. Bold we have an account published by him nearly forty years after the events. Slightly abbreviated, it will be read with interest.

"The turn and course of affairs in this land in the years 1687-8 were such as produced an almost universal acknowledgment that that sort of people who were so vehemently offended with the Sermon against Persecution and the Plea for Moderation towards Dissenters, which I published in the year 1682, had been Popish tools." Mr. Bold then alludes to the revival of the talk against him on the part both of the laity and clergy, as if the hostile proceedings both in the ecclesiastical court and at the assizes were justifiable, and feels himself called upon, after a long forbearance, to lay before the world a plain narrative of matters of fact. The time and occasion of the Sermon, and the reason for publishing the "Plea for Moderation," are referred to as explained in these publications.

"The next assize after the Sermon was published, the grand jury presented me for that Sermon. I was afterwards indicted for it. The same method was taken with respect to my Plea for Moderation. At one assize I traversed the indictment for the Sermon, which was therefore to be tried the next assize; viz., in the spring following. About the latter end of October next, after I had traversed the indictment for my Sermon, I was cited to appear at the Bishop's Court. When I appeared there, articles were exhibited against me for the Sermon against Persecution. A copy of them being delivered to me, I was ordered to bring my *personal answer* to them in writing the next court day. This I did, and the same day additional positions and articles were exhibited against me for the Sermon, &c. and the Plea. A copy of these being delivered to me, I was required to give in my personal answer in writing unto them the next court day, which was by adjournment (I think) the first Tuesday in March following. The crimes I am charged with are set forth."

The Sermon is styled a "scandalous libel," and its author is declared "with a malicious mind and wicked intention to derogate from and procure contempt to the ecclesiastical laws and statutes, &c., as corrupt and superstitious, to the great damage of the Bishops," &c.

Passages were quoted in the indictment from the Sermon and the Plea to sustain the charges. They are too long for quotation; but the passages we have already given contain some of the words against which exception was taken.

"My answer," Mr. Bold continues, "to the articles being said to be worse than the books, the Bishop thought fit to determine

that all was fully proved against me, and proceeded to sentence, which was, that I should preach three recantation sermons,—one in the parish church of Dorchester, one in the parish church of Blandford, one in the parish church of Shaftesbury, on three Lord's days in the forenoon, before Easter; and that copies of the sermons should be given to him before they were preached, to be approved; and that if I should refuse to make such recantation, I should be suspended from the benefice of Steeple, . . . and that I should pay the expenses of Andrew Cosen, the promoter, as taxed by the Bishop. This Andrew Cosen is styled by the Bishop a gentleman. This is certain, he was the Bishop's butler. On Thursday evening, in the week after the Bishop had pronounced his definitive sentence against me, the judges came to Dorchester. On Friday in the forenoon, two indictments against me were tried. One was for my Plea for Moderation towards Dissenters." The indictment was faulty and quashed. The judge ordered an amended indictment to be brought in in the afternoon. The other indictment was for a letter. An apothecary of Blandford had an information laid against him at the sessions for Nonconformity, and was obliged to pay £20. Six or seven weeks after, Mr. Bold saw the apothecary at church on a Lord's day in the forenoon and afternoon. Being indicted again for three months' absence from church, Bold wrote him a letter which contained these words: "Be sure you do not stoop to nor be afraid of the Tories, but approve yourself a resolute, faithful Protestant. Honest Protestants will not always be under a cloud." These words were placed in the indictment. "The jury went forth, and after a short stay returning, declared they found me guilty of the book. But the judge telling them that they were not sent out upon the book, but the letter, answer was made of the letter, which served the turn as effectually as if it had been given at first." At night the rectified indictment was brought in, founded upon the Plea for Moderation, and also an indictment upon the Sermon. From the Plea, the words objected to were,—

"There ought not any thing to be universally required of all men in the service of God, but what has either equal agreeableness to all men's tempers, or a direct and certain tendency to advance the interest of religion more or less in all men. For some instances which are proper to excite and quicken devotion in some men's breasts, have not the like tendency in reference unto others; and the goodness of the end will not justifie an universal imposition, till you can first of all make all men of one complexion.—Our present Sovereign doth in his Declaration concerning Ecclesiastical Affairs take notice, that some ceremonies may even lessen that piety and devotion, for the improvement whereof they might happily be first introduced, and consequently may well be dispensed with."

The sermon against Persecution was indicted as *seditious;* but

no words being inserted in the indictment, to remedy the defect the sermon was tacked on to the indictment.

"The Judge having set a fine upon me for every one of the indictments, the gaoler was ordered to take me into his custody, and to keep me in prison till the fines should be paid. The Monday following, the apparitor, with the promoter, came to the prison and cited me in the Bishop's name to appear at his Court the next day, certifying that if I did not appear there I should be proceeded against for contempt. But I, having appealed to a higher Court, sent one the next day who executed the orders of that higher Court upon the inferior officers in their own Court. Thus the Bishop's definitive sentence and final decree, with the former proceedings, were vacated. Before the next Court day came the Bishop was dead.

"When I had continued about seven weeks in prison, the fines set upon me by the Judge being paid, I departed from the prison and returned to Steeple. But the promoter being alive, the appeal was to be followed, those who had principally concerned themselves against me expressing a fulness of assurance that they should have certain success above. The proceedings in the Bishop's Court were transmitted. Yet before those who did interest themselves against me could begin their prosecution above, the promoter fell sick and died. And thus ended the ecclesiastical prosecutions against me. And here I do own I esteem my being indicted and suffering for my *Sermon against Persecution* and for my *Plea for Moderation*, and more particularly for my persuading a person in the evil days to approve himself a sincere Protestant, a much greater honour than any worldly preferment. I could mention several instances of treatment I experienced from those who concerned themselves against me on the aforementioned accounts, which were not attended with any marks of civility or good-nature; but the persons are dead, and I am willing their works should die with them. They had the pleasure to give vent to the inclinations and passions which had the ascendant over them. And I heartily bless God I then had and still have this satisfaction, that neither their number nor their power did terrify me into any wicked or cowardly compliance. They after all their efforts left me where they found me, and there, through the great patience and goodness of God, I am at this time.

"Steeple, May 26, 1720."

Having given, for the most part in his own words, Mr. Bold's account of these strange proceedings, we will afford the Bishop the opportunity of relating the same story, and shewing the share he directly or otherwise took in its chief incidents.

The narrative opens with a letter addressed to Archbishop Sheldon, dated Symondsbury, Aug. 12, 1682.

"From Blandford I had only time to send your Grace a sermon of one Sam. Bold, of my diocese, who is supposed to be supported by Mr. Trenchard* and others. And this indeed will shew your Grace that

* John Trenchard was, if not the first, one of the most distinguished of a Dorsetshire family of that name, who were active in promoting liberal politics both in their own county and in the nation generally. He was educated at Oxford, entering New College, 1665 (Wood's Athenæ, IV. 405); was elected

our grand jury hath expressed their dislike of him, and Judge Raymond hath caused process to issue forth against him; and now it will be fitt time to call him into the Ecclesiastical Court also, where he shall have according to his deserts. And I humbly beg the favour of your Grace to grant him no dispensation to hold two livings, should he attempt it; though he thinks to hold them both without me. But I have sent to the patron of the first living to present a new clerk, and have issued forth a sequestration upon the profits in the mean time. Yet he endeavours to collect them.

"I prevailed also with the grand jury to return thanks to H. M. for executing the penal laws against Dissenters, which may be of great concerne if other counties would doe the like, both in answering further objections against prosecutions of the laws, and for prevention of any sort of toleration, which the fanatics now persuade themselves to gain in a small time by prevalent friends at court.

"W. Bristol."

There were other pens at work against Mr. Bold; and one of the correspondents of the Archbishop forwarded to him this anonymous letter, probably addressed to one of the neighbouring clergymen:

"Rev. Sir,—I heare that some are about to move his Lordship the Archbishop of Canterbury to grant a dispensation of non-residence on the vicarage of Shapwick, in Dorsetshire, to one Samuel Bolde, vicar there. If any such thing should be, pray inform my Lord that this same Bold hath lately preached and printed a most seditious and phanaticall sermon against persecuting, with his name at large affixed to itt, printed for A. Churchhill, at the Black Swan, near Amen Corner, most dreadfully damning the execution of the laws against Dissenters under the title of persecution, and damning eternally all such as put the laws in execution against them. This I thought good to advertise you of, that my Lord may know what manner of spiritt the man is of. His ———* will be that he will allow the whole revenue to a curatt. But such a man's curatt will be under a very ill influence and direction. Pray accept this so needful advertisement from an unknown hand."

Early in the following year, the Bishop of Bristol writes thus on the topics which he knew would interest the Archbishop:

M.P. for Taunton, 1679, and voted with the party who sought to exclude the Duke of York from the throne; was accused of participation in the plot with Lord William Russell, but escaped the fate of Lord Russell. His journey home was an ovation, and the congratulations of "anabaptists, sectaries and other disaffected persons," as reported to Government, gave great umbrage. On the landing of the Duke of Monmouth, Mr. Trenchard fled to France. He took an active share in the Revolution, and held various offices under the Government of William and Mary, and at the time of his death in 1695 he was Secretary of State. In accordance with the remark of the Bishop in the letter above, Mr. Roberts, in his Life of the Duke of Monmouth, says, "Every evil design against the Government was judged to have Trenchard at the bottom of it." (I. 213.) Madam Trenchard, the mother of Sir John, is often mentioned as a patroness of the Nonconformists of Dorsetshire. One of their ministers was often private chaplain and tutor in her family.

* Illegible.

"January 6, 1682.*

"I caused Mr. Bold to be summoned to appear to answer articles, which he did not; therefore ordered a further day: for about that time Dr. Raines, of the Commons, sent me his opinion of that scandalous sermon, with his advice to grant letters of request for prosecution of Bold in the Arches. For he says, though the sermon be a virulent libel in the main against the ground of church discipline, yet no particular passage directly impugns any one canon of the Church of England. And considering the weakness of the advocates and proctors here, and the industrie of the factious to support this person, least any failure should be in proceeding, if it be your Grace's pleasure to permit it, I shall readily assent to it: the Dr. offering now to prosecute him warmly.

"Harding,† the late minister of Poole, coming in again by the late Lord Chancellor's suspension of the commission, makes the fanatics there to triumph, and gives offence to the gentlemen in Dorset who were concerned in that commission; but I hope Mr. Etherick‡ will out the person again, by your Grace's favour and assistance. And there is as great need of a commission for Lyme, where one Short,§ son to him in Exeter prison, reads logic and philosophy to young people, scholars, and so makes it a nursery of the fanatics. I have sent to Mr. Etherick concerning both, and shall acquaint your Grace with his resolutions. I know my Lord Keeper will help us in so good a work.

"Upon the 5th of November last, the head constable of the hundred was taken as a preacher, and he and his conventicle convicted before one Mr. Elliston,‖ justice of peace; but no warrant being granted out by the said justice till I came into the county, the criminals conveyed away their goods and made them over to others in that time, and now no distress is to be found by the constables. I have ordered the informer and

---

* 1683. The new year then beginning March 25.

† The Bishop intended probably to write "Hardy." Samuel Hardy was a man of some eminence in his day. He was educated at Wadham College, Oxford, and lost his degree of M.A. through scruples as to the oaths. He officiated at Poole, Charminster, Weymouth and Newbury, sometimes connected with the Church, but not conforming to the ceremonies, and sometimes amongst the Nonconformists. He was closely connected with the Trenchards, and some of his persecutions arose from his assisting John Trenchard in an election at Poole, in which the Court candidate, a son of the Lord Chancellor, was defeated. He was chosen minister of Poole, 1667, but was dismissed for Nonconformity by a commission from the Crown bearing date Aug. 23, 1683. He died at Newbury, 1690.

‡ The reference is doubtless to Anthony Etterick, of Holt Lodge, Wimbourne, the Recorder of Poole. Before him the Duke of Monmouth was first taken on his apprehension subsequent to the battle of Sedgemoor. Etterick was an antiquary as well as a lawyer, and contributed the addition to Dorset in Camden's Britannia.

§ Amos (or Ames) Short, the father, was one of the ejected ministers of Lyme Regis, of whose sufferings from persecution Calamy has given a particularly full and interesting account. (Continuation, pp. 416—420.) The son, to whom the Bishop refers, educated young men for the ministry at both Colyton and Lyme, and removed to London to become pastor of an Independent congregation at Miles Lane. (Wilson's Diss. Churches, I. 465.)

‖ This name, also variously spelt Ellisdon and Ellesdon, was that of a magistrate of Charmouth. He made an unsuccessful attempt to procure a passage for Charles II. after the battle of Worcester. Though not coming up to the Bishop's ideas, he was, according to other accounts, sufficiently active as a Tory magistrate.

his witnesses to appear at the quarter sessions next week and renew the conviction. This case I must in duty lay before my Lord Keeper, for such trashing of the execution of the laws will ruine us."

"January 17, 1683.

"Harding, of Poole, is out again and dares not appear. Bold skulks about, for fear of being taken up by a peace process which is out against him. If by your Grace's favour I may grant letters of request to the Arches (other agents being too weak to deal with him below), Dr. Raines promises me to prosecute him vigorously."

"January 26, 1683.

"Bold is in my Court for his late Sermon and Plea, and one Wyne* for some public expressions in the pulpit tending to sedition. . . . . I have been lately with the magistrates of Lyme and Bridport, two corrupt corporations which have poysoned all these parts a long time, and I perceive from them that a *scire facias* would bring in their charters with great ease, being assisted by the King's friends there; farther I dare not move. This county is much amended since Mr. Ellisdon, a late justice of peace, was put out of commission."

"August 29, 1683.

"May it please your Grace,—At Sherborne assizes, Mr. Sam. Bold appeared and had been acquitted, had I not been there to cause two new indictments to be drawn against him, and since that ordered him to be summoned into the Ecclesiastical Court for the same seditious Sermon."

"February 24, 1683.

"May it please your Grace,—I have for some time continued the Ecclesiastical Court at Bridport. . . . . I called Mr. Wyne, minister of Dorchester, into the Court for preaching publickly some passages that tended to the encouragement of the phanatiques and discouragement of loyal men in that town, which he made an open recantation of before the clergie of my diocese in Court at Bridport, and hath promised future obedience to the canons and constitutions of the Church. At last I gained the assistance of my Chancellor, and came to a sentence against famous Mr. Bold for his Sermon and Plea, and sentence being passed, he entered his appeal; in which I hope your Grace will please to allow the impudent man no favour."

The original decree and sentence of the Ecclesiastical Court, penned in barbarous Latin (one of the words used is *doctrinibus*), signed by the Bishop, the Registrar, &c., is included in the Tanner MSS. (Vol. cxxix. fo. 104). It specifies Bold's refusal to make the required retractation, and his consequent suspension and deprivation of the living of Steeple.

March 2, the Bishop writes to the Archbishop, enclosing the sentence against Mr. Bold, and informing his Grace that Bold appeals to the Court of Arches. "I wish myself health to be able to act now, yet what I have done is much envied by many that should have more discretion."

* This was Robert Wyne, the author of "Elisii Campi, the Paradise of Delights," 12mo, 1672. He was at Tammerton, in the county of Devon, and at Clifton, in the county of Dorset. Calamy intimates that being harassed in his place, he left the Church soon after the Revolution and turned Nonconformist. (Account, p. 284.)

The last letter of the Bishop's bears date March 10, 1683-4:

"My present sickness kept me from the assizes at Dorchester, but I sent my chaplain thither, who upon affidavit made that Mr. Bold owned his Sermon and Plea in my Court and was under sentence for it, the judge committed the said Bold to gaol and fined him 100 marks."

At last the Bishop's efforts are crowned with success. The humble but heroic clergyman, against whom, after nearly two years of civil and ecclesiastical persecution, sentences of suspension, deprivation, fine and imprisonment, threaten utter ruin, lies in Dorchester jail. He was innocent of the crime of Nonconformity, for he scrupled not to profess the creeds and to obey the rubrics of his Church. His only crime was that he pleaded for mercy towards those whose conscience forbad a like conformity. His diocesan, who should have been his protector and friend, was the man to put into action all the machinery of persecution. But the poor prisoner was less an object of compassion than the Bishop, whose last energy was expended in his persecution. After a week of weeks' imprisonment, Bold was free, and had nothing more to fear from Bishop Gulston, who had received the inevitable summons, and was *where the wicked cease from troubling*. His successor in the see of Bristol was Bishop Lake. From him Bold had no trouble. Unmolested he returned to his pulpit at Steeple. The other living of Shapwick he did not hold after 1688.

The next of his printed sermons was on his favourite subject: "An Exhortation to Charity, and a Word of Comfort to the Irish Protestants; being a Sermon preached at Steeple, in Dorsetshire, upon occasion of the Collection for Relief of the poor Protestants in this Kingdom lately fled from Ireland. By Sam. Bold, Rector there. (Rom. viii. 18.)" He styles persecution "a horrible and inexcusable villany. The name is so apparently odious that no party, whilst under the guilt and in the practice of the thing, will own it."

"It thwarts and contradicts all the dictates of human nature. It breaks all the bonds and ties of common civility. It is most opposite and contrary to and most destructive of all the purposes and designs of every part and branch of the Christian religion. It abuses those for whom God has the greatest love. It vilifies and casts infamy upon them whom God will for ever glorify. And if God will reward his suffering, persecuted servants with the greatest measure of glory, what shall become of the persecutors and troublers of his people? If they impenitently persist in their persecuting course, it were better for them they had never been born; or, being born, that a mill-stone were hanged about their necks, and they thrown into the depth of the sea."

Here for the present we must pause. In another and concluding chapter we shall give an account of Mr. Bold's other works, and of his correspondence, so far as it has yet come to light, with the great philosopher of England, John Locke.

GEORGE HARRIS: A MEMOIR.

Chapter IV.

FROM ENGLAND TO SCOTLAND.

The biographical facts contained in our last chapter may be said to relate as a whole to the subject of missionary exertions.

The objections which have been from time to time urged against such exertions in connection with Unitarianism will be found to owe all their force to that limitation of Unitarianism which confines its application to the necessities of a mere theological controversy. "Why should we proselyte others to our opinions? Why should we contend with others because their opinions differ from ours? Those whom we would indoctrinate, or with whom we may quarrel, are just as good when let alone by us as when interfered with on our part. We can enjoy our own convictions among ourselves without bringing them into public discussion, and the enjoyment will be greater when undisturbed by such discussion." This is the course of thought which has been expressed with more or less distinctness in justification of a policy that would circumscribe Unitarian efforts by the existing line of established congregational agency.

I freely allow that if Unitarianism does consist only of this difference of opinion, it may be right to deal with it in this spirit of reservation. I am afraid I must go further, and declare that those who practise the reservation do hold their Unitarianism as a mere matter of opinion, and are therefore consistent in demanding a sectarian exclusiveness for that which is of a distinctively sectarian character. But I have no sympathy with this kind of sectarianism. I take the view of the case which I have already described as strongly influencing the life I am attempting to portray. I adopt Unitarianism because, as far as it goes, it expresses my views of Christian truth; and what I am concerned with is the religious obligation under which I lie with regard to that truth, and not any difference which may separate me theologically from others. It is necessary to my religious life that I should avail myself of the opportunities of religious influence that are offered to me. I have thus to "let my light shine before men." If I refuse or neglect to do so, I so far cease to be a religious man. If a church refuses or neglects to exert the religious influence it possesses, it so far ceases to be a religious institution. The principles of Christianity and the history of Christianity equally bind us to diffuse the knowledge and blessing of Christian truth through society, and our not doing so is rightly taken as a tacit confession that we do not really aspire to the character which our profession indicates. No Christian body can vindicate the reality of its faith in the sight of mankind except by such measures as will prove that faith to be efficient for the practical

purposes of Christianity; and when that efficiency is proved, all objections to the faith on mere doctrinal grounds become comparatively powerless.

If, in the discharge of the work of benefiting the world by promoting religious belief and obedience, we have to uproot error as well as to establish truth,—that is but one of the conditions under which our duty is to be fulfilled; and if in fulfilling it we come into collision with those who dissent from our views, —that is but a necessary sacrifice required from us by fidelity. When the work imposed upon us is mainly that of removing error and withstanding opposition, we are under no less responsibility to discharge it, on the broad ground of religious obligation, than we should be if that work related to the enforcement of an acknowledged moral duty. We cannot separate between the moralities of the two kinds of work as they relate to ourselves. We have indeed to be careful that we do stand upon the broad ground of religious responsibility, and not upon any narrow one of sectarian opinion only; but it is not for us to choose the line of action which that obligation opens before us. That is prescribed for us by the natnre of our faith and its relation to the circumstances in which we are placed. Unitarian missionary efforts must, on both the accounts just alluded to, partake largely of doctrinal and controversial exposition. We may wish the case were otherwise, but so it is; and, if we act up to that case at all, we must conform ourselves to this necessity belonging to it.

Is there nothing to counterbalance the peculiar irksomeness of the Unitarian position? What say we to the consideration that our distinctive views of Christian truth are necessary to reconcile to any belief in Christianity the mass of persons who are now alienated from religion altogether? Such, most of us are convinced, is the fact; and in that fact we discover our special calling. A more honourable calling none could desire. We have it in our power to shew that Christianity is worthy of all acceptation, on the very grounds on which orthodoxy has been rejected or been found impossible of credence. We cannot shew this without much theological contention; but to do so, even by means of that contention, is to advance no narrow sectarian cause, but the wide, general interests of Christianity itself.

I cannot forbear from noticing here with strong approbation the sentiments on the subject of Unitarian missions which were expressed in the last number of the Christian Reformer by Mr. Hodgson Pratt. The respective relations of religion and theology to missionary efforts are set forth in his paper with a special force, arising from the practical considerations to which the paper is devoted.

When we look back upon the course of events that has just passed under our review, and bring it into connection with

events with which we are now concerned affecting the same part of the kingdom, the theory of Christian duty on which I am insisting presents itself to us in a peculiarly interesting form.

Let us imagine that during his Lancashire ministry Mr. Harris had, in carrying out his missionary designs, met with treatment essentially different from that which he experienced. If his brother ministers had cordially co-operated with him, encouraging his efforts and assisting him by similar efforts of their own, and if the wealthy and influential laity had sanctioned and supported the measures thus undertaken by the clergy, it cannot be doubted that Unitarianism would have occupied a much more advanced position than it does occupy, in relation to the present population of the province. I am willing to allow,—I have indeed already intimated,—that both the ministers and people to whom I have alluded were as conscientious in their conduct as Mr. Harris and his friends were in theirs; but it is none the less true, that the one conduct prevented results which the other would have produced. In what has fallen under my observation in connection with the missionary efforts lately originated by the Provincial Assembly, I have been particularly struck with the manner in which the localities now demanding attention answer to the localities that received similar attention at the time I have been reviewing. This correspondence proves that the seed which was sown, though it might be afterwards neglected, did not perish, and it certainly indicates that if the sowing had been tried upon a wider field it would have been rewarded by a co-extensive harvest. Since the year 1825, with which we had last to do, two facts have happened bearing forcibly upon the question under notice. One of them is, the great change which has taken place in the current statements of orthodoxy. That change, by which the prevalent religious belief has adapted itself to the civilization of the age, has been altogether in favour of those views of Christian doctrine with which Unitarianism is identified. The other fact is, the adoption of views substantially Unitarian by numbers of persons who have separated from Methodism. A new door of usefulness has thus been opened to Unitarian zeal in addition to the ordinary means of influence of which that zeal might avail itself. The Rochdale and Rossendale societies, before alluded to, might almost be supposed to have been raised up in order to prepare Unitarianism for that further work of Methodist conversion which after events seemed formed to put into its hand. Surely no one can dispute the conclusion, that if a general scheme for missionary operation had been in efficient exercise while the two facts I have mentioned were in the course of development, much that is lost might have been secured, and more would have been accomplished than the agencies actually at command could effect.

Happily we see this matter in a clearer light than those who

immediately preceded us were permitted to do. An ardent desire to engage in missionary work prevails throughout the Lancashire and Cheshire province, instead of the opposition or indifference that formerly prevailed. The case is so far reversed, that where coldness on this subject was the rule and warmth the exception, now warmth is the rule and coldness the exception. This I believe to be the state of feeling among most of our congregations, though much needs to be done in the regulation and application of that feeling in order that it may be made available for the practical purposes on which it legitimately bears. This is a beneficial and hopeful alteration of circumstances. But while we rejoice on its account, we ought not to forget our debt of gratitude to those who "bore the burden and heat of the day" in which our joy was wrought out. Mr. Harris and those who acted with him may at times have acted unwisely and intemperately: they may have yielded to some of the temptations presented by the strife through which they passed, and manifested some of the infirmities that cling to humanity in spite of its purest intentions: but what we are reaping is that which they sowed. In sacrificing themselves for the common good, they fulfilled the law of Christ on our behalf as well as on their own; and while we do not blind ourselves to their faults nor commit injustice toward their opponents, let us not withhold from them the generous and just acknowledgment that "other men laboured, and we have entered into their labours."

What I have previously spoken of as the special calling of Unitarianism in its missionary relations, is applicable in a striking manner to the state of things to which I am about now to direct the reader's attention: I mean the religious condition of Scotland at the time to which my narrative has brought us. I have to speak of efforts that were made to establish and extend Unitarian preaching in that country; and, in defence as well as in explanation of those efforts, I shall have to bring out the fact that there, even more than in England, it was needed that some form of Christian belief should be rendered prevalent which was reconcilable with the renunciation of orthodoxy. Unitarianism could only supply that form fairly and honestly; and, considering the peculiar conditions of the need to which I have referred, the promotion of Unitarianism there by missionary operations had commendations distinctively its own.

I have said that Mr. Harris removed from Bolton in September 1825. He immediately commenced his ministry in Glasgow by conducting three services there on Sunday, October 2. He had accepted the invitation from Glasgow some months before. An application had, indeed, been made to him from the Glasgow congregation as early as November 1824, conveying their unanimous wish that he should assume the direction of their affairs. This application he at first declined to comply with, but it was

renewed in more pressing terms, and with such manifestations of the determination of the people to uphold him in the office to which he was called, as persuaded him to consent to it. In his letter of acceptation, dated April 20, 1825, after referring to his unwillingness to sever the affectionate bonds by which he was united to his Bolton congregation, he thus speaks of the motives by which he was influenced in choosing the particular sphere of labour upon which he was about to enter:

"At the same period that I received the invitation to which I am now replying, I was also invited to take the pastoral charge of the congregation of York Street, St. James's Square, London. The office was superior, in a worldly point of view, to the one with which you favoured me. London is a more commanding station even than Glasgow; the influence which I should immediately have obtained in our denomination much greater—the society to which I should have been introduced more splendid. But then I also recollected that London could ensure to itself a minister, and that it was probable that Glasgow could not; that the metropolis of England had other and able advocates of truth, whilst at Glasgow there was but one Unitarian chapel; and that therefore my obligations to the truth of Heaven called upon me to prefer Glasgow. Notwithstanding those obstacles which those who know the world, and are acquainted with mankind and the workings of the human heart, can alone duly appreciate, my determination is now fixed to do all I can to promote the cause in a quarter where its enemies are more numerous, its friends but few, and those despised,—and to stand in the front of the battle between truth and error, where other persons perhaps would not be found to brave the contest."

It may be well to look, for a short time, at the sphere of labour which thus opened itself before him; endeavouring especially to estimate some of the difficulties by which it was characterized. I will do so at the risk of repeating some things which I may have elsewhere written or said.

Scotland, as every one knows, has been long distinguished by an almost uniform profession of religion both as to doctrine and discipline. It is so distinguished now, although it is pretty equally divided into three different sects, because those sects differ from each other only as to matters within the common sphere of Calvinistic theology and Presbyterian polity. But at the time of which we have to speak, before this threefold division took place, the general uniformity was more marked to outward observation than it is at present. The Established Church of England has but few points in common with the Dissenting bodies in that country, and those bodies embrace a great variety of character and administration among themselves; but in Scotland, the Established Church is the type after which the Dissenting bodies have been constructed. The consequence of this state of things is, that whatsoever opposes itself to an orthodox belief, is in Scotland met with a far stronger

resistance than can be offered in the South. When that which passes under the name of heresy presumes even in the South to assert itself decisively, it has to contend with a combination of forces which the peculiar danger draws into an unwonted union; but, in the North, the presumption of such a proceeding is considered greater by reason of the greater national agreement it contradicts, and the combined force directed against it is stronger in proportion to the more favourable circumstances under which it is originated. It is truly the case with the heretic there, that "his hand is against every man, and every man's hand against him." Not that heresy has not been a native growth of Scotland, or that quite independently of foreign operations it has not there had a luxuriant spread. Both these things are among the plainest facts; but they are connected with another fact no less evident than they, viz., that heretical convictions have not altered the orthodox profession, but have been cherished under the protection of such profession. The Scotch heretic has always been a man scrupulously careful not so to develop his heresy as in circumstances of danger to forfeit the credit of orthodoxy. In addition to the reason for this prudential proceeding which is contained in the extraordinary force of public opinion already mentioned, it is worthy of passing notice that the Scotch character is, generally speaking, open to the influence of public opinion in a greater degree than the English character is. Find him wherever you may, a Scotchman will shew himself peculiarly submissive to the circumstances around him. Rouse him to resistance by some intolerable wrong, and no man will fight more furiously or more obstinately; but his normal condition is that of pursuing his own interest in a spirit of accommodation which often extends to subserviency. It may be well to mark how nearly, in spite of such causes as those referred to, the heretical tendencies of the people of this country have approached toward revolutionizing the established belief. It will be seen that the nearness of approach only made the impossibility of the revolution being effected on the undermining principle, which was alone adopted, the more apparent.

Every reader of Burns's poems must be well aware that heresy on the questions involved in the Unitarian controversy prevailed extensively during his time in the West of Scotland. Not only could he with impunity express his own sympathy with the New-light party, and reprobate and satirize the Old-light party, but the manner in which his theological utterances were received, proves that the leaven of his opinions was rapidly leavening the whole lump of Scotch society. The *Epistle to John Goudie, of Kilmarnock*, who had written a notoriously heretical book of Essays, declares more than personal assent. The anticipation of triumph in which it indulges, implies a large popularity for the side it espouses.

"Auld Orthodoxy lang did grapple,
But now she's got an unco ripple;
Haste, gie her name up i' the chapel
Nigh unto death:
See, how she fetches at the thrapple,
And gasps for breath."

That the East as well as the West of Scotland was deeply affected with a disbelief of the authorized faith, is well known to every one in the slightest degree acquainted with the character of the Edinburgh society of this time.

In the North, Dr. Gerard, who filled the theological chair of King's College, Aberdeen, is said to have delivered lectures on the person of Christ composed after the same method as that which Mr. Belsham had pursued at Daventry; and though he never avowed his theological opinions, it cannot be doubted that the influence of his teaching must have been detrimental to orthodoxy. In fact, his son, who spoke of his father as "without doubt a Unitarian in the strictest sense," also expressed his belief that a large portion of the clergy of the North of Scotland were of the same opinions.* Dr. John Evans, whose name has been already mentioned in this biographical sketch, says of Gerard's lectures in combination with those of Professor Cambell, "Replete with good sense and unostentatious piety, they have left an indelible impression on my heart. They first taught me to think and reason for myself in matters of religion—at the same time uniformly guarding the pupil against intolerance and bigotry."†

It would be easy to multiply testimonies to the heretical repute into which this nominally Calvinistic country had fallen during the latter half of the last century. One of them which has fallen under my observation is no less curious than conclusive. In an almost forgotten book—Myles's *Chronological History of the People called Methodists*—reference having been made to the introduction of Methodism into Scotland, it is added: "One great design in sending preachers thither is, to make a stand against the overflowing of Arianism and Socinianism in that country."‡ In Lindsey's *Historical View*, we are furnished with the following declaration, copied from the books of the Presbytery of Stranraer, which a minister who felt aggrieved by his former subscription was, after his case had undergone discussion in the Presbytery of Stranraer and Synod of Galloway, admitted to make. The parishioners of Inch not only approved of this declaration, but sent to the Presbytery of Stranraer a petition, in which they stated their own attachment

---

* Monthly Repository, Vol. VIII. p. 326.
† Christian Pioneer, Vol. X. p. 162.
‡ Myles's History of the Methodists, p. 57.

to the principle of scriptural liberty, in terms no less strong than those employed by their minister.

"I, Andrew Ross, Minister of the Gospel in the parish of Inch (for the exoneration of my conscience, more particularly with respect to the terms of ministerial communion injoined by this Church), hereby declare, That I firmly adhere to the fundamental principles of the Protestant religion, namely, that the holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the only rule of faith and practice; that the exercise of private judgment is the undoubted right and duty of every Christian and of every Christian minister, and that it is the best means of discovering the true sense of Scripture; that the Lord Jesus Christ is appointed the sole Head and Lawgiver of his Church, and the only Master in religion. And I also declare, that I reject all doctrines and practices that are inconsistent with these principles, as witness my hand this third day of January, 1776. Andrew Ross."*

On reading such a remarkable document as this, one might be led to expect that some effort would have been made to gain the liberty it claims for the whole Scottish kirk, and thus to secure an honest expression of the interdicted views really held by a great portion of its clergy and people. Such, however, was not the case. Both ministers and laity reconciled themselves to the contradiction between their belief and profession, and were only anxious that they should not be disturbed in the position they occupied. This dishonourable procedure produced its natural fruits. The theological opinions thus surreptitiously cherished contracted an immoral taint. The grounds of Christian belief on which those opinions rested were never fairly stated. The utmost subtility was employed in devising compromises between truth and error. A sceptical spirit took the place of religious faith in any sense. Whatever would shake conviction was gladly accepted as lessening the value of that which it had been determined to slight. A deeply-rooted and wide-spread infidelity sprung up as the result of these various influences; and those who could not yield to unbelief were thrown back upon orthodoxy as the only shelter from irreligion. It is the object of a creed-bound church to identify its creed with Christianity, and the danger to which it is ever exposed is that of producing a renunciation of Christianity whenever the creed is disputed—a danger the worse and not the better when the renunciation is not openly avowed.

The Scotch are a people of a highly metaphysical genius. It is their habit to regard the questions that present themselves to them in a strictly philosophical light, and to content themselves, on matters in which they are interested, with mere abstract reasoning. Orthodoxy is a philosophy: Calvinism is this philosophy reduced to its severest expression. Such a system by its very

* Lindsey's Historical View, p. 560.

nature must always have strong attractions for people of this kind; and even when its theological dogmas as such are found to be indefensible, its philosophy may retain a strong hold upon their minds. It is quite wonderful how the persons with whom you meet in Scotland—believers, unbelievers, semi-believers and would-be believers—can, by means of metaphysical speculations, manage to accommodate themselves, as upon principle, to a uniformity of practice which would seem to be essentially opposed to the true state of things among them. This habit of philosophizing—indulged as it is till the mere intellectual exercise itself becomes of more importance than the result to which it is professedly adapted—presents as formidable a barrier against any attempts to change the religious profession in consistency with doubt or disbelief, as the most unreasoning assent to the authorized faith could do. Having thus persuaded themselves to silent acquiescence in the established forms, the heretics will be generally found even more averse to any open declaration of their heresy on the part of others than the orthodox are. An inconsistent and unfaithful resistance is always more intolerant than a sincere and upright one. In Hugh Miller's *First Impressions of England and its People,* there is a story about his confuting some southern heretics which curiously illustrates the national characteristic on which I have been just remarking. He describes himself as entering into a dispute on the subject of the atonement which was being carried on in the public room of an inn in Newcastle-upon-Tyne. His part of the dispute consisted in his enforcing upon his audience the doctrine of moral necessity as compelling the Deity to adopt the principle of expiation, in contradistinction to his attempting any defence of that principle on common grounds of morality. "I was curious to see," he says, "how the metaphysics of our Scotch Calvinism would tell on such an audience, and took up the subject much in the way it might be taken up in some country churchyard, ere the congregation had fully gathered, by some of the 'grave-livers' of the parish, or as it might be discussed in the more northern localities of the kingdom, at some evening meeting of 'the men.'" I have no doubt that the "audience" was completely confounded by the display, and the conclusion of the tale is very naturally given thus: "The countryman was silent. 'You Scotch are a strange people,' said one of the commercial gentlemen.'"*

Whatever advantages for the Unitarian cause in Scotland might have arisen from the New-light movement within the Established Church, they were more than neutralized, at the time of Mr. Harris's Scotch ministry, by the evangelical revival of which Dr. Chalmers was the main instrument. The impulse which his

* First Impressions of England and its People, pp. 8—10.

preaching gave to orthodox sentiment was the commencement of a religious movement that cannot be called less than national. His genius, his eloquence, his earnestness, pre-eminently fitted him for being a leader of opinion; and the form in which he set forth the doctrines he promulgated was singularly adapted to the character of the people he influenced. He identified orthodoxy with a certain philosophical view on which he strongly insisted, and by which he gained for it a renewed attention of the Scotch mind. He laid science as well as revelation under contribution to the advancement of his views; and he gave to those views a social application which was scarcely less marked than their theological one, and thus conciliated the practical habits of his countrymen in their favour. The effect of his efforts was moreover mightily assisted by the plain fact that they were, after all, but a summons to the honest adoption of conclusions that were professed in dishonesty. Account for it as we may, however, the change produced was marvellously great. The courage of the adherents to the hereditary Calvinism was invigorated, and their utmost exertions were put forth on its behalf: the faith of the standards of the Church was re-accepted by the unbelieving and zealously acted upon by the hitherto indifferent; and those who still continued to retain their heretical latitudinarianism slunk into a deeper concealment than they had been accustomed to practise before. There never was a clearer manifestation of the weakness of a theological position which is not supported by integrity, than that which the thorough defeat of the moderate party by the rising evangelicals presented. It was of course a consequence of this change of circumstances that the opposition to anything like a profession of Unitarianism was increased, both on the part of those who hated Unitarianism for its own sake, and on the part of those whose cowardice withheld them from professing it. This increased opposition existed in its greatest force at the period with which we have now immediately to do. Dr. Chalmers began his ministry in Glasgow in 1815, and closed it in 1823; and this was the portion of his course in which his most powerful popular agency was developed. In undertaking, therefore, the work of Unitarian propagandism in Glasgow in 1825, Mr. Harris threw himself into the thick of the fight when his cause had all its natural disadvantages intensified to the greatest possible degree.

A few anecdotes illustrative of the strength of hostility with which Unitarianism had at this time to contend may be introduced here, especially as they relate directly or indirectly to the individual whose ministerial course we are following.

When Mr. Harris commenced preaching at Greenock, it was several times the case that he could not get any one to post up the placards on which his lectures were announced. Besides

this, after being posted, they were very frequently torn from the walls. He met the difficulty by going out with a friend between twelve and one o'clock at night, and sticking up the bills on the walls with his own hands.

On his announcing an intention to preach in the Greenock theatre, he was remonstrated with by his friends, who set before him the personal danger to which he would thus expose himself. He gave no heed to the remonstrance, however, and on his appearance upon the stage a great disturbance was commenced, and some missiles were thrown at him from the gallery. He calmly opened the Bible and read, from the 19th chapter of Acts, the account of the tumult excited in the theatre at Ephesus by Demetrius and his craftsmen. This immediately gained the attention of the whole assembly, and on his concluding the Scripture he said, "Let us pray." The result was, that he afterwards delivered one of his most effective discourses amid the profoundest silence.

The builder of the Union-Street chapel in Glasgow never obtained an order for another building of like importance. He and his friends attributed this to the common prejudice against everything connected with Unitarianism. His consenting in the way of his trade to promote Unitarian purposes was sufficient to produce his ruin in business.

Shortly before Mr. Harris came to Glasgow, five members of the Unitarian church were discharged from their employment under the following circumstances. An elder of the kirk, a calender by trade, mentioned to his minister that he had persons in his employ belonging to different sects, and particularly specified Catholics and Unitarians. The minister said that the Unitarians were dangerous people, for they were generally intelligent and led others astray. The elder summoned the five Unitarian workmen before him, told them what the minister had said, and discharged them on that ground.

A well-dressed man once met Mr. Harris in the streets of Glasgow, and suddenly turning from the causeway into the carriage road said, as he went aside, "Devil!"

I shall conclude this chapter with a short account of the Glasgow church previous to Mr. Harris's pastoral connection with it.

The Unitarian society in Glasgow consisted originally of certain individuals who had adopted Universalist opinions. This was not an uncommon nor an unnatural origin of such a society in Scotland. The Edinburgh and the Paisley societies arose in a similar way, and Universalism was likely to be the first conclusion to which a reaction from Calvinism would lead. The first minister I can find any notice of in connection with Unitarianism in Glasgow is Dr. Spencer, who afterwards settled as a surgeon in Bristol. He had been a Baptist minister at Alcester,

in Warwickshire, and had become a Unitarian, when all his prepossessions were in favour of Trinitarianism, by simply following out a resolution to study the New Testament in its original language. After this change of opinion, he went to Edinburgh to prepare himself for the medical profession, intending, if possible, to unite the practice of medicine with the preaching of Christianity. In consistency with this intention, he conducted a religious service every Sunday in his lodgings during his residence in Edinburgh. This service was commenced in the year 1791. He had continued the work for about two years, when a gentleman from Glasgow, by whom he was accidentally heard, persuaded him to repeat the same service in that city; and his doing so led to his removal to Glasgow, where he became a public and avowed preacher of Unitarianism. The hostility directed against him in this capacity was extremely bitter. Stones were thrown at him through the windows of the room in Spreuil's Court in which he preached. His very life was in danger, several fanatics having threatened to lay violent hands upon him if he continued his labours, and an assault upon him being on one occasion actually attempted. On that occasion Mr. Auchenvole, the father of Mrs. Harris, stepped forward and told the assailants that they should not harm Dr. Spencer except by passing over his dead body. These violent proceedings did not, however, check the efforts which were being made in the hated cause. After Dr. Spencer, at the conclusion of his medical studies, removed to Bristol, the Unitarian interest was kept up by means of lay preaching. In 1803, the Rev. James Lyons visited Glasgow as a missionary from the Unitarian Fund. His was the first Unitarian mission to Scotland, and he succeeded here, as elsewhere in that kingdom, in giving a new impulse to the Unitarian faith. He was followed in 1809 by Richard Wright, whose labours were remarkably effective. Mr. Wright was able to bring Unitarianism into public discussion. A disputation in which he engaged was continued by adjournment for several evenings and attended by crowded audiences. It was said that on the last evening as many as two thousand persons went away who could not get into the place where it was held. In 1811, Mr. Wright paid a second missionary visit to Glasgow. He found then a division in the society; one party meeting in the Trades Hall, and the other in Provan's Hall; but he happily succeeded in uniting both parties under the ministry of the Rev. James Yates. Mr. Yates had previously engaged to take charge of Unitarianism in Glasgow, and he entered upon his office before Mr. Wright left that city. At an early part of Mr. Yates's ministry, the chapel in Union Street was built, and thus the cause which had for so long a time been struggling for existence, obtained the established character and position it has con-

tinued to maintain to the present time. Mr. Yates removed from Glasgow to Birmingham in 1816, and his place was taken by the Rev. Benjamin Mardon, who remained in Glasgow till 1825, when, as we have seen, Mr. Harris accepted an invitation to the pulpit.

THE NATIONAL-REVIEWER CONTROVERSY.

Sir,

Allow me to follow the example of Mr. Higginson, and to declare myself the author of the letters in your pages signed An Unitarian Layman.

I have only, in conclusion, to remark, that all which the National Reviewer has written leaves untouched, as I have no doubt it will ever remain, the real difficulty of his position, that if the gospel narratives do not truly record a bodily resurrection of Christ from the dead, they are valueless as evidence of a resurrection at all. I admit that the re-appearance of Christ after death, independently of a resurrection of the body, might give strong evidence of the existence of a future state, if the gospel narratives had recorded the event in that form. The question, however, is, not which kind of evidence would be the most satisfactory, but whether the gospel narratives of the resurrection are true or false. To myself, and to many others, the validity of the Reviewer's arguments would involve the destruction of all belief in Christianity as a divinely-authorized communication from God to men.

In the course I have taken I have acted in accordance with words which I once heard from the lips of a revered instructor of my own: "It is desirable that all well-educated persons should be 'ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh them a reason of the hope that is in them' as Theists and Christians." The duty of defending views which I believe to be of the highest value to mankind, and upon which the whole course of my own life has rested, has placed me in opposition to a friend whom I highly value, and for whom, whatever may have been our differences of feeling or opinion, I once more declare my high personal respect and warm personal regard. I now take leave of this controversy with the satisfaction of feeling that I have not, in the course of it, written a word which, at its close, I wish to recall.

Wm. Rayner Wood.

Singleton, near Manchester, June 6, 1860.

[We regret that the accidental mislaying of this letter prevented its insertion in our last No.—Ed. C.R.]

ON NATURAL DEPRAVITY.

As these are reforming times, and as some of the most distinguished members of our body have been recently reviewing, and to some extent remodeling, their former convictions, it has occurred to me that it may be profitable to truth to draw the attention of your readers to the philosophical view of natural depravity, which has long appeared to me to stand nearly as much opposed to the old Unitarian hypothesis as to that of popular orthodoxy; for while the popular notion is, that mankind was created in a perfectly immaculate state, without any moral infirmity, and pure and spotless as heaven's own light, but that by the transgression of the first human pair they suffered a total alteration of their nature, which morally degraded not only the first parents, but all their posterity, and thereby became so utterly depraved as to be incapable of any good thought or deed, and so prone to moral evil as to be by their fallen nature totally alienated from God and goodness; on the other hand, the Unitarian notion has been, that mankind have not suffered any change of nature or moral defilement by any transgression of their primeval ancestry, but retain the same unfallen nature as their first parents possessed at their creation. And so far I agree with them. But they appear to have adopted the orthodox notion, that mankind having come at first from the hand of their Maker as perfectly immaculate as angels, afterwards became personally and actually vitiated by individual transgression of the laws of their nature, and by which men *in general* became sinners; but which individual transgression, so far from being natural or hereditary, there have been many human beings who never transgressed at all, but retained the original purity of their unfallen nature,—as exemplified in the case of infants, idiots, and other obviously irresponsible persons, as well as in the case of such religiously-inspired persons, who have been so far exalted in spirit, that they, like Jesus Christ, may be said to have lived in heaven while remaining on earth.

Now it appears to me that the truth lies between these wide extremes,—namely, that man was not created or designed to be immaculate, which is proved by his mental and moral endowments being all fallible and infirm; and shewing that his natural constitution at his creation contained the seeds of moral infirmity, which afterwards bore depraved fruits; and thus being by nature a finite and fallible creature, he was mercifully endowed with the principle of self-preservation, as a means of protection to himself and his species; yet this self-preservative power was not only *liable* but *prone* to degenerate into selfishness, self-gratification, covetousness, and consequent estrangement from the principles of purity and justice, and therefore from God and goodness. And what is this but a sinful tendency, or at least a moral in-

firmity? Yet this tendency or proneness is the natural consequence of his finite and fallible endowments, and which proneness renders him as much the subject of moral evil as though it were the consequent effect of a primeval fall of the first human pair; and in either case it is clearly the post-adamite law of his nature.

The error of each party, therefore, seems to be, the supposition that man was originally created as an immaculate and nearly infallible being: and then the only real difference between the two is, that one supposes that the falling into transgression of the first human pair contaminated not only themselves but all their posterity; and the other, that mankind, without having any natural proneness to evil, have nevertheless individually fallen into sin, and that so quasi universally, that moral delinquency is the general rule, subject only to a comparatively few exceptions.

The word depravity, as coming from *de pravo*, signifies to make bad, vitiate or corrupt; and I use the word in its strictly literal sense in inferring that the natural principle of selfishness tends to make bad, vitiate and corrupt, and gives a natural proneness in that direction, until it is checked and influenced by superior mental agencies, i.e. just and enlightened principles refined by religion and sound philosophy, which the orthodox would call conversion to religion; and till so checked and influenced or converted, every sort of moral ill will follow in the train of the selfish principle. And if this be so, it may justly be called *natural* depravity; and if natural, it is not very far from *hereditary* depravity: not, however, that a son is bound naturally to be as depraved as his father was.

Hence the wide difference that has hitherto existed on this subject has probably been more of a verbal than of an essential nature, and for want of a true and precise definition of terms. And this may also be said of some other differences between orthodoxy and heterodoxy; and if opponent parties would carefully define the words they use, they would often see that they mean nearly the same thing.

In the volume of the Monthly Repository for the year 1823, p. 378, will be found a philosophical view of the origin of evil under my name, which argued that as man was endowed with only limited attributes, and could not be otherwise endowed, he must be liable to err in the miscalculation of happiness, and that the consequence of error in that calculation must inevitably issue in the production of moral ill; and this argument applies equally well to natural depravity as to the origin of moral evil, if indeed they are not identically the same; but I am not obliged to understand the word depravity in the same sense as it is used by the popular world, as implying that mankind are utterly vicious and wholly incapable of any good thought, motive or deed. On the contrary, I assume that, as men are not always under the influence of gross self-interest, they may *naturally* be capable of many

good thoughts, motives and actions; for why should they not, when uninfluenced by the selfish principle, have just feelings of moral right and wrong, as well as devout thoughts of God, "according to what a man hath"? Yet the natural proneness to gratify selfish desires still remains in all matters where *self* can become the question, and there are but few who are able to get entirely free from this influence; for how difficult is it to induce even sensible and religious people to see through the mist of their own self-interest or selfish prepossessions, and discern the true line of justice and truth; the veil of natural depravity intervenes and beclouds their vision, so that, though in general they can see clearly the small mote in another's eye, they cannot see the beam in their own eye.

It appears to me that our Unitarian ancestors, justly offended by the Calvinistic definition of natural depravity, were driven by the principle of counteraction to the opposite extreme, which prevented their seeing that it is the natural proneness to the selfish principle that forms the essence of the moral infirmity in question and the germ of all sin and wickedness, and without which man would have no motive to do wrong; and this proneness may be seen in all stages of humanity from the cradle to the grave.

Is not the true line betwixt these wide extremes well drawn by Pope?

> "Mean though I am—not wholly so,
> Since quickened by thy breath."

As I am not too proud or opinionated to be set right or refuted if wrong, I shall be glad to see any observations in reply from your more deep-thoughted readers.

Kingsdown, Bristol. G. Pulleyn Hinton.

THE INAUGURATION OF DR. PRIESTLEY'S STATUE AT OXFORD, JULY 3, 1860.

Time, the assertor of all truth, all right,
And the redresser of all wrong, hath cast
On Priestley his exalting smile at last,
Crowning his honoured brow with wreaths of light.
The clouds which veiled his radiancy have past;
And now, a fixed star breaking through the night,
He shines from heaven's celestial concave vast,
And shall shine on for ever, true and bright.
Doubt not—despair not. Though the present hour
Be wrapt in mists and with misfortunes shrouded,
Truth, knowledge, virtue, shall burst forth unclouded
In the serene benignity of power—
That all-subduing power which tireth never,
Nor tarrieth—onward urging—onward ever!

John Bowring.

HYMN BY SIR JOHN BOWRING,

SUNG BY THE CHILDREN OF THE PROTESTANT DISSENTING CHARITY SCHOOL OF GEORGE'S MEETING, EXETER, MAY, 1860.

With gentle words and gracious look,
The loving Saviour spoke and smiled,
When, in his welcoming arms, he took
A happy Child, and blessed the Child.

For childhood's earliest day begins
In the bright heav'n of innocence,
Ere wand'ring thoughts or tempting sins
Seduce its erring footsteps thence.

Would that as following years roll on,
Life's infant brightness might endure;
And leave us, when those years are gone,
Pure, as the happy Child is pure!

O God! who veil'st the future o'er,
Thro' whose thick darkness none can see,
Protect, preserve, redeem, restore,
The innocence of infancy!

TRANSLATION OF PETER BURMANN THE SECOND'S APOSTROPHE TO HUGO GROTIUS ON BEHOLDING HIS PORTRAIT.

Let Grotius, whom the Muses fashioned for arts refined,—
Let him, the greatest in law,—let him, on the lyre the greatest,
Afford an example which shall be told till the ages grow hoary,
Which the future may read with awe, and ponder dumb with amazement.
Was it for this, Mother-country, thou barest so great a son,
That thou, to a child of thine own, mightst become a cruel stepmother?
That, like the prisoner's, his hand might be bound in unmerited chains,
And bidden itself to hide in the dungeon's desolate darkness!
That hand, which shed the light o'er the stores of the learned past,
Renowned and ennobled for ever by its own eloquent pen!
That hand, to thee too devoted, and by its deeds approved,
And which so often had boldly thy glory dared to maintain!
Allia was not a day in the Roman year more impious
Than that which caused a Grotius to bear the bonds of a felon.

July 13, 1860. J. Dare, Jun.

CORRESPONDENCE.

REV. W. HINCKS AND MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE.

Sir,

I have just now enjoyed the very great pleasure of reading Mr. Kenrick's interesting Memoir of our late venerable friend, Mr. Wellbeloved; and whilst cordially joining in the general feeling respecting its fidelity and beauty, I would ask permission to offer through your pages a correction in a minor point relating to myself. It would be inferred from Mr. Kenrick's statement (p. 198) that my having intimated my intention to resign the office I held in the College at the end of the session 1838-9, was one of the circumstances "which induced the Committee to consider very seriously the question of a change of locality." Now in fact my resignation arose from the projected change of locality. I cannot now say whether what I judged necessary for myself at all hastened the crisis; but I know that I abandoned my situation after twelve years' service, and when I had no opening for a return under favourable circumstances to ministerial duties, very unwillingly, and only from a full conviction that the changes then in immediate contemplation would not admit of my remaining with any advantage to myself. It is true there had as yet been no formal decision as to the plans to be adopted; but my impression is that Mr. Wellbeloved had signified the time when he wished to be relieved before I took the decisive step. I am certain that I was influenced by a belief that the College would be removed to Manchester, not to London, and that I should not have the opportunity either of teaching Theology, the object of my highest ambition, or with sufficient advantage to myself of continuing to teach Intellectual, Moral and Political Philosophy, without the necessity of also teaching Mathematics. I felt that my duties at York had been far too extensive, and in bringing them within reasonable bounds I would have preferred that class of subjects in which I had carried on original investigations, and which had from early years engaged much of my thoughts, to that, however important in itself, in which I could only hope to select good books and assist the students in mastering their contents. Thinking I had sufficient reason to believe that my wishes would not be gratified, I judged it best at once to withdraw from my office, which I should not have done had there been a prospect of Mr. Wellbeloved continuing for any time his invaluable services at York, or a reasonable probability of my obtaining anything suitable to my views in the new arrangements then in contemplation. As I have referred to my once turning my thoughts to the Theological chair, I may be permitted perhaps to say that I was encouraged in this by Mr. Wellbeloved himself, whose kind partiality doubtless over-estimated my qualifications, and that from a very early period critical and exegetical theology had seemed to me the pursuit in which I had the best prospect as well as the strongest desire of excelling. I readily, however, yielded to circumstances, and warmly approved of the choice which was made. Excuse, dear Sir, my occupying your valuable space with a personal explanation, and believe me your constant reader and sincere friend,

Toronto, C.W., June 18, 1860. William Hincks.

PETER AND PAUL.

Sir,

In your last No. (June, 1860) I have read a paper upon the "*Alleged* Difference of Doctrine between Peter and Paul." Though ingenious in argument, I doubt how far it may be satisfactory in its results to the general portion of your readers. The writer very properly terms the difference between Peter and Paul an "alleged" difference; but I think he is not equally felicitous in terming it "a difference in *doctrine*," or rather in the manner of teaching the same doctrine, as he explains it. For surely no one can read Paul's account of this difference (Galat. ii.) without coming to the conclusion that it was not merely a difference of opinion between two eminent missionaries of Christ on matters not necessarily connected with the principles of Christianity, but that it was a difference, both in opinion and practice, between Paul and his opponent, which in Paul's estimation subjected his opponent to culpability, because of his unfaithfulness to the cause of Christ through the propagation of doctrines subversive of Christianity, meriting and calling forth Paul's severe rebuke, found in Galat. ii. 14 to end. This opponent of Paul's has been, indeed, "alleged" for centuries to be Peter, but without the slightest foundation, as I shall attempt to demonstrate from proof which, having accidentally been thrown in my way, has satisfied me that the adversary of Paul, alluded to in the Galatians, was not the apostle Peter, but the schismatic Cephas, referred to in 1st Corinthians.

Some time since, on perusing Conybeare and Howson's Translation and Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles, I found a note upon Gal. i. 18, wherein it is stated that in this verse "Cephas," not Peter, is the reading of some of the oldest MSS.; and not only in this verse, but in every other verse of Galatians where Peter is the present reading, excepting in ch. ii. 7, 8; and, moreover, that "Cephas" is the reading of these MSS. all through 1st Corinthians, as in our English Bibles, Peter being nowhere mentioned in that Epistle.

Applying this new rule, I subjected these two Epistles of Paul to a closer examination than formerly, and I found that it not only removes the "alleged" difference between Peter and Paul, but that it throws great light also upon various other passages in these Epistles; and not on these only, but, through them, on all the other Epistles of Paul; because, being thus led to discover that Cephas was a different person from Peter, it was easy to see, from the way in which Paul speaks of him by name both in Galatians and 1st Corinthians, that Cephas was a schismatic, a Christian heretic, one who, though appearing to be one of the pillars of the Nazarene church of Jerusalem, separated from that church to propagate, in opposition to Paul, false views of Christ's reign upon earth, grounded on the national (Luke xxiv. 21; Acts i. 6) delusion that Messiah was soon to come down from heaven and "restore the kingdom to Israel," excluding, however, all heathen converts, unless by circumcision (Acts xv. 1) they had previously become Jewish proselytes.

All this I have endeavoured fully to bring out from Paul's Epistles, aided by the Acts of the Apostles, and to set down in chronological order, in what I have termed "A Pauline History of Cephas," which, if suited to your pages, I shall be happy to send you.

In the mean time I shall conclude by shewing, under sanction of these

ancient MSS., the true reading of all the passages in Galatians wherein Peter is distinguished from Cephas.

Galatians i. 18: "Then, three years after conversion, I went up to Jerusalem to see Cephas [not Peter], and abode with him fifteen days; but of the apostles I saw none, indeed no other save James, the Lord's brother."

Galatians ii. 1, &c.: "Then, fourteen years after conversion, I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me. I went up by revelation, and communicated to those who were of reputation that gospel which I preached among the Gentiles, but privately, lest by any means I should run, or had run, in vain. I told them that even Titus, whom I brought with me, though a Greek, was not compelled by me to be circumcised; and farther that we had come up because of false brethren having been brought into the church at Antioch clandestinely, to spy out the exemption from circumcision which we (heathen converts, viz. of Antioch) have through Messiah Jesus, to whom, however, I gave place, no, not for an hour, in subjecting the heathen to circumcision." Ver. 6: "But at the conference which ensued,* those persons (after named) who seemed to be somewhat (whose early membership gave them weight in the society), although whatsoever they had formerly been made no matter to me, for I knew that God (in selecting for His service) is not guided in His choice by personal influence,—those leading men made no addition to me (that is, to my gospel, as before): on the contrary (ver. 7, 8), when they perceived (from what Barnabas and I told them at the conference†) that the gospel of the uncircumcision had been committed to me, as that of the circumcision had (from an early period) been committed to Peter [not Cephas],—for God, who had hitherto wrought effectually through Peter's [not Cephas'] apostleship to the circumcision, had been mighty through my apostleship to the Gentiles: therefore (ver. 9) these leading men, who seemed like pillars of that church, namely, James, Cephas [not Peter] and John (James, the Lord's brother, Cephas, and John Mark, the nephew of Barnabas), perceiving the favour conferred upon me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that we should continue our services to the Gentiles, and they continue theirs to the circumcision. But" (ver. 11)—at this verse, with Mr. Locke, we must understand Paul as about to tell the Galatians what led to his going up to Jerusalem fourteen years after his conversion—"when Cephas [not Peter] was at Antioch (where I found him on my return to that city with Barnabas,‡ after my first mission with him into Asia Minor), I withstood him (viz. Cephas) to the face, because he was to be blamed; for before that certain persons" (these "false brethren" lately alluded to) "came from James (as they alleged, although James denies it§), he (Cephas) did eat with the Gentile converts; but after they had come, he (Cephas) withdrew and separated himself (from the Gentile converts), fearing those of the circumcision; and the other Jewish converts dissembled likewise, insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away by their dissimulation. Therefore when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Cephas [not Peter] before them all: If thou (Cephas), being a Jewish Christian, hast hitherto conducted thyself towards Gentile con-

* Acts xv. 6. † Acts xv. 12. ‡ Acts xiv. 26—28. § Acts xv. 1, 24.

verts as any other Gentile convert would do, and hast not hitherto insisted upon circumcision by such converts, as do unconverted Jews (guided solely by the law of Moses), why dost thou now virtually compel the Gentile brethren at Antioch to become Jewish proselytes if they would unite in Christian fellowship with their Jewish brethren? We, Jewish converts, although by natural descent a portion of the peculiar people of God, and therefore not ceremonially sinners like the Gentiles, feeling assured since the advent of Messiah that a Jew has no grounds for justification and acceptance with God from undeviating adherence to the law of Moses, but through faith in Jesus as our Messiah,—even we have believed in Jesus Messiah, that we might be justified through faith in Messiah. But if while we thus seek to be justified through Messiah, we also find ourselves, regard ourselves, as sinners like the Gentiles (i.e. ceremonially unclean by Christian communion with uncircumcised Gentile converts), is not this to make Messiah the minister of sin? God forbid. For my part, should I begin to build up again the things which I have been pulling down, I should in my conscience feel myself a transgressor."

If from the readings of this second chapter of Galatians, thus corrected by these ancient MSS., we have satisfactory evidence that it was Cephas, not Peter, with whom Paul had the disagreement at Antioch, this evidence is strengthened, or confirmed rather, by a reference to Peter's speech at the Jerusalem conference to which this chapter relates:

Acts xv. 7—11: "And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up, and said unto them, Men, my brethren (viz. Jewish), ye know how that a good while ago (by the baptism of Cornelius) God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the words of the gospel and believe; while God, who knoweth the hearts, bear them witness by giving unto them the Holy Spirit, even as unto us, and put no difference between us and them, purifying (i.e. ceremonially) their hearts by faith. Now, therefore, why should ye try God by putting a yoke upon the neck of these disciples (Gentile converts) which neither our fathers nor we (Jewish converts) are able to bear? So that we believe that, through the grace of the Lord Jesus Messiah, we shall be saved, even as they."

June 18, 1860. PETER.

GEORGE THE THIRD AND DR. PRIESTLEY.

I HAVE read a communication from George III. to one of his Ministers on the subject of the riots in which Priestley's house was burned. His Majesty says, in his short, emphatic way, that the riots must be stopped immediately, that no man's house must be left in peril; and then he orders the march of certain troops, &c., to restore peace; and concludes with saying, that as the mischief did occur, it was impossible not to be pleased at its having fallen on Priestley rather than another, that he might *feel* the wickedness of the doctrines of democracy which he was propagating.—*Croker, quoted by Cunningham, Walpole's Letters,* IX. 406.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Roman Sepulcral Inscriptions: their Relation to Archæology, Language and Religion. By John Kenrick, M.A., F.S.A. London—John Russell Smith. 1858.

We have too long delayed our intention to notice this extremely interesting volume. It originated in two papers, read before the Yorkshire Philosophical Society, designed, the author tells us, "to direct the attention of the members to the monuments preserved in their own Museum, and at the same time to shew how the labours of the antiquary connect themselves with the history of manners, institutions and opinions. The subject, I believe, has not been specially treated of in this country before; and as the remains of antiquity are now studied with more enlarged views than in a former age, it may have an interest for a wider circle than that to which the original papers were addressed."

We feel greatly indebted to Mr. Kenrick for putting his papers into this shape. They form a volume of but 70 pages,—full, however, of most instructive illustration,—the table of contents indicating the points of interest. One or two of these we shall adduce, reserving our chief space, however, for the religious bearing of the subject.

How long have we been in arriving at the ancient wisdom! It was the prohibition of the twelve tables, *Hominem mortuum in urbe ne sepelito neve urito.*—P. 6.

"It was the all but universal practice in the ancient world to inter the bodies or ashes of the dead beyond the limits of the cities. Even in Egypt, where the practice of embalmment might have rendered it safe to retain them in the vicinity of the living, the cemeteries of the great cities were placed on the opposite side of the Nile."—P. 5.

"The principal roads at Rome seem to have been lined with sepulcres for a considerable distance, especially the Appian, the 'Regina Viarum' as it is termed by Statius.* Atticus was buried at the fifth milestone from the city on this road, Gallienus at the ninth.† No urn or sarcophagus has been found within the walls of Roman York, but the traces of interment begin immediately beyond the gates."—P. 6.

The frequency of the sepulcral lamp (p. 16) suggests to our minds its perhaps original emblematic hope. The complaint that "physicians were in vain," is of ancient date.‡—P. 19.

"Pliny has not preserved the name of the unhappy man whose monument declared, *turba medicorum se periisse*, that he had died of a multitude of doctors."§—P. 19.

One interesting part of the volume gives instances of inscriptions "which throw light on the history of the Latin language, or illustrate that vulgar idiom and pronunciation which has influenced the formation of the modern Italian." We have the "Hic jac*it*," the counterpart of our rustic English, "Here *lays*." "'Poor letter *h*,' too, was treated with the same barbarous caprice of old as now, being omitted where it should stand, and interpolated where it should not. Those who omit the aspirate, however, are always more numerous than those who insert it: in Italy they ultimately gained the ascendancy, and it is banished

* Sylv. 2, 2, 13.
† C. Nep. Att. 22.
‡ Gruter, p. 340.
§ Nat. Hist. 29, 1.

in pronunciation from modern Italian, which follows in this respect the usage of the old Romans, who said *ædos* and *ircos*."*

The difference of manners and customs between the ancient and modern world is curiously illustrated in the humble station in life not being withheld from the epitaph. The dealer in pigs, *negotiator suarius*, the female greengrocer, *negotiatrix frumentaria et leguminaria*, occurs. Above all, *stupidus gregis urbani*, the clown of the city company of mountebanks,† so designates himself on the tomb of his wife.—P. 25.

"It would not be mentioned now on the tomb of a medical practitioner, that he had begun by practising his art in many market-places "*fora multa secutus.*"‡

Further on, Mr. Kenrick quotes an inscription of a higher kind, which, he well observes, for its expressive simplicity might be placed on the monument of a Macready: *Ingenuum comœdum, propter singularem artis prudentiam et morum probitatem.*

The latter part of the volume becomes naturally of deeper interest, since it treats of the light the inscriptions throw on the social relations, the domestic affections and the religious belief of the people of whom they are the record. The language of genuine sorrow, the writer truly observes, is simple and concise; and this appears to have been the distinctively Roman. A beautiful instance is given in the title-page of the book. Many others are adduced. Amongst other sentiments, such as that which Sydney Smith expressed on the tomb of his son Douglas, "His death was the first sorrow he ever occasioned his parents," frequently occurs.

"We learn," says Mr. Kenrick (p. 38), from the sepulcral inscriptions that the Romans had the same familiar substitutes as ourselves for the formal appellations of father and mother, *mamma* and *tata*," as well as their diminutives.

"In one instance§ a man erects a monument to his aged *bonne, Nonnæ suæ*. The word is not found in classical Latinity; but it is the undoubted origin of *nun*, and may suggest that conventual vows were originally taken chiefly by aged females. In Italy at the present day it is the familiar name for grandmother."—P. 38.

We give our remaining space to the religious bearing of inscriptions.

"In those inscriptions which enter into a fuller enumeration of public services, one difference is striking to a person accustomed to modern ones, namely, the absence in the former of all mention of acts of social benevolence. It is true that the erection of a fountain, the construction of a road, the dedication of a temple, the exhibition of gladiatorial and floral games, the bequest of a legacy for an annual feast, and similar acts of popular munificence, are often commemorated, as titles of honour; but I do not remember to have met with a record, originating in Pagan times, of a life devoted to the alleviation of misery, to the relief of indigence, to the removal of ignorance and vice. Such virtues belong especially to the school of Christianity. The following inscription would be proved by its tenor to relate to a Christian woman, even if the date did not fix it to the middle of the fifth century of our era: *Deo fidelis, dulcis marito, nutrix familiæ, cunctis humilis, placato puro corde, amatrix pauperum.*"‖—Pp. 35, 36.

---

* Quinct. 1, 5, 20.

† Orelli, 2645.

‡ Spon. Misc. p. 143. There has been a great controversy respecting the medical men of Rome, whether they were slaves; the monuments shew them to have been commonly Greek freedmen.

§ Orelli, 2815.

‖ Orelli, 4657.

Again, p. 48:

"One remarkable contrast strikes us on comparing ancient with modern, Heathen with Christian inscriptions—the entire absence in the former of anything like resignation to the will of a Superior Power, or any acknowledgment of a benevolent purpose in a painful dispensation. If the gods are alluded to, it is in the way of complaint. *Manus lebo* (levo) *contra deum qui me innocentem sustulit,** is a bold defiance of Providence."

Upon the belief of the Romans respecting the condition of man after death, Mr. Kenrick observes (p. 52), that the almost universal commencement of epitaphs with Diis Manibus, or the abbreviation D.M., might seem to indicate an universal belief in the continued existence of the spiritual part of his nature; but how far the formulary may be taken as a proof of the continuance of the belief, is a question very difficult to decide. He cites inscriptions of varying character, yet the preponderance is in the doubting key. "*Si* quis," said even Tacitus of Agricola, "piorum Manibus locus; si, ut sapientibus placet, non cum corpore extinguuntur magnæ animæ, placide quiescas."

"Upon the whole," Mr. Kenrick concludes, "the evidence, negative even more than positive, of the Roman sepulcral inscriptions, abundantly confirms the testimony of Heathen as well as Christian writers to the absence of any definite and practical belief in a future state in the three or four first centuries after the Christian era. Yet few would be able tranquilly to acquiesce in the doctrine of annihilation. They sought in other sources for that assurance which neither religion nor philosophy could afford them. Never was the practice of magic, incantations, necromancy and mysteries more prevalent than during the period in which Christianity was slowly supplanting the ancient superstitions. It was evident that the fulness of the times was come, and that if the world were not to be divided between the victims of religious imposture and the disciples of Epicurus, light from on high must visit the earth."—P. 56.

"Other inscriptions," Mr. K. continues, "not properly sepulcral, afford the same proof of the loss of all vital power in the old religion." A remarkable proof is, that among all the religious monuments which the Museum of the Yorkshire Philosophical Society contains, there is not one to any of the great gods of the popular creed, while there are several to the gods of the barbarians, shewing that the popular religion was altogether "a creed outworn," and men were seeking something else.

"Art," he says—and the remark has its lesson among ourselves now—"Art had familiarized men with the human representations of their deities, and even by the perfection of its visible and material works had destroyed the belief in their spiritual existence and invisible power. Philosophy had exposed the folly of an anthropomorphic polytheism; poetry and the stage had made the gods contemptible. Nothing was left which could awaken reverence and love: instead of aiding, the popular religion checked the impulse of the mind to connect the ideas of infinitude and deity. But in the gods of the barbarous nations, who had remained without art, and without a mythology converting gods into men, there was something obscure, mysterious and indefinite; something on which imagination could fasten, and which it could readily invest with supernatural attributes. He who looked on the Apollo of the Belvedere with no other feeling than that he beheld the triumph of the sculptor's art in action and expression, was overcome with a religious awe

* Gruter, p. 820. The hands uplifted in protest are sculptured on the monument.

when he gazed on the unmeaning faces and half-bestial forms of Egyptian deities. The genius of Rome was tolerant of all religions but the true; a hearty belief in the gods of his own Pantheon would not have prevented a Roman soldier from doing homage to those of the country in which he was quartered, and seeking thus to gain their favour or avert their displeasure. But this will not account for the extensive diffusion of the worship of Phrygia and Thrace, Persia and Egypt, throughout the Roman empire. It was certainly an indication of a restless longing for something that could supply nourishment to the craving for religious faith which exists in the heart of man, and feeds itself on superstition when it can find no purer aliment."—P. 58.

Such being the state of the general Roman mind, what a prophecy do we not read in it of the coming nations of the North,—what a testimony to that Providence which was preparing the one for the other!

We make no apology for the following concluding extract:

"Among the sights of modern Rome is none more interesting than that long gallery of the Vatican called *Delle Lapidi*. On the right-hand wall are encased the sepulcral and other monuments of emperors, consuls and commanders of legions, with their numerous and pompous titles,—inscriptions to the gods and their priests. The elaborate and tasteful ornaments, the finely-cut letters, the classical Latinity—all indicate the rank and station of those by whom or in whose honour they were raised. On the left are the Christian monuments, chiefly supplied by the Catacombs, which, during the ages of the obscurity and persecution of the Church, served the Christians for sanctuary and cemetery, and even for a temporary dwelling-place. The slabs from their tombs are of coarse material—not Parian, or Carrara marble, or Egyptian porphyry; the letters are rudely made, the spelling and the syntax betray the humble rank and imperfect literary attainments of those who supplied them. No mention is made of ample space allotted to the tomb, no anxious care is expressed to perpetuate the inheritance or provide for a long succession of occupants. The Christian perhaps fell asleep in the expectation that the second coming of his Lord, to call the tenants of the tomb to judgment, would not be delayed beyond a few years. The Roman of family had three names; the Christian had no *gens* with which to claim affinity; he was a proletarian, a mere unit amidst the millions. One simple name served to identify him; his sepulcre might even be nameless—a circumstance of rare occurrence in regard to Pagan tombs.* How strikingly does the contrast confirm the declaration of the apostle, that 'not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble were called.'† But to this contrast there is another side. The Heathen monuments represent a decayed and dying superstition; the Christian, a living and triumphant faith—'the weak things of the world chosen to confound the strong.' Their inscriptions speak of resignation, peace and confidence; their emblems, the Good Shepherd, the Dove, the Anchor, the Ark of Noah, all breathe the same peaceful, humble, and yet hopeful spirit." Pp. 58, 59. R.

Physiology for Common Schools, in Twenty-seven Easy Lessons. By Mrs. Charles Bray. London—Longman, Green & Co. 1860.

Among the marked improvements of our time is the great change for the better which has taken place in the style and matter of books meant for young people and for common schools. Among the earliest reformers in this line, we believe, was Miss Edgeworth in her Popular Tales, &c. We ought never in this connection to forget that admirable little work, which can hardly be superseded, "Evenings at Home," by Mrs. Barbauld and her brother, Dr. Aikin. Peter Parley, just deceased, Miss

* Fabretti, p. 545. † Maitland, Church in the Catacombs, p. 10.

Sedgwick, Mrs. Follen, Harriet Martineau, have all done excellent service in this way, as well as a host of others. And now we welcome Mrs. Bray into the same goodly company of labourers for the right training of the youthful mind. This unpretending little volume of 112 pages, divided into twenty-seven lessons, contains nothing like profound knowledge nor minute detail. If this had been attempted, the little book would have been less adapted to the purpose in view, namely, to convey some plain instructions on the preservation of health to the children of the poor who attend our common schools. "This small work," says the author in her Preface, "is chiefly intended as a lesson-book in our common schools, and is an attempt to make intelligible to the children of the poorer classes so much of the nature of the vital organs and functions as shall give them some correct ideas with respect to the means by which disease may be avoided and health preserved." The language of this little manual is simple, the statements clear, the lessons important, and the physiological science correct. It would be useful in the hands of Sunday-school teachers who feel it a duty to impart secular knowledge on a Sunday, and who may think that any sound instruction respecting the works of God can hardly be classed as "godless education," or a desecration of the sacred day of rest and worship. Some acquaintance with the structure and functions of the human body is now felt to be requisite in our common schools. And we have visited schools in Edinburgh and London where such knowledge is effectively imparted. There is nothing strange in this. The strange thing is, that this want should not have been felt long ago. Here are we bearing about living bodies, placed in relation to various mechanical and chemical agents around us, yet how few of us have given ourselves the trouble to acquire any proper knowledge how we should regulate that wondrous living mechanism, which may be affected favourably or otherwise by air, light, heat, food, drink, stimulants, mental feelings, and a thousand other causes. Chemistry and mechanical science are considered essential parts of a liberal education. Inconsistently enough, physiology is only beginning to be so regarded; yet physiology comes home to men's business and bosoms not less than chemistry or the knowledge of mechanics. In the co-ordination of the sciences, physiology stands higher than chemistry—living tissue above dead matter; though, from the greater complexity of its phenomena, it must be necessarily less advanced, less understood, than chemistry or any of the sciences of unorganized matter. Every one who desires to possess a sound mind in a sound body will be benefited by acquaintance with the class of important facts and lessons to which Mrs. Bray's little volume calls attention.

The very headings of the lessons are suggestive and stimulating to the curiosity of young people; such as, "Why must we take Food? Why must we wash ourselves? Why must we keep our Rooms well aired? How is the whole of the Body fed? The Teeth. What is Thirst? A Peep into the Stomach. Why do we breathe? How to keep the Blood pure and healthy. When is Cold dangerous? Mischief of Tight Clothing. Disease of the Body often causes Disease of the Mind." Each of these topics is treated with remarkable perspicuity and brevity, in language which may be easily understood by children of eight or ten years of age. And as we are all but children of a larger

growth and only a little wider experience, there are lessons and principles here taught which older persons would do well to heed.

We extract a few specimens of the style and simplicity of the thought.

"If you could look inside your bodies, you would see that there must be a constant wearing away of every part, because every part is in constant motion. Put your hand to your side and you will feel your heart beat; put your finger to your wrist and you will feel your blood running along; and although the motion in some parts is too fine to be felt or seen, yet there is no rest anywhere in a living body, and change and motion go on always inside us, whether we are awake or asleep, whether we stand still or move about.

"Now wherever there is motion, there must be wear and waste. In an engine or a machine, the parts are always wearing away by rubbing against each other, and the faster they move the faster they wear away. It is the same in the living body; the faster the motion of the parts, and the more we exert ourselves and move our bodies and work our limbs, the faster the wear and waste goes on, and the more food is required to make up the loss. We want, therefore, a certain quantity of food every day to keep the life within us. . . . . But the wearing away that goes on in a living body is not like the wearing away of machinery; it is more like the burning away of fuel in the fire. Part of the coal that has been burned and done with turns to gas and goes up the chimney; in something like the same manner the parts of our body that have given out their nourishment and are done with turn to breath and perspiration, and go off from our bodies.

"The breath comes away out of our mouth and nose. The perspiration comes away through the little holes or pores in the skin, which are too small to be seen except through a microscope, but which lie close together all over the surface of the body."—Pp. 4, 5.

On p. 7, the reason is shewn why cleanliness is so essential to health, and, as a good man once said, next to godliness. Some people think they have done their duty by their bodies in the matter of cleanliness, if they drench the cheeks and the tip of the nose; they forget that the whole surface of the body transmits perspiration, and therefore no one can be really clean, sweet and healthy, who does not wash regularly the whole body. The simple method of using a rough towel dipped in water and applied over the whole body, is now extensively practised by the middle classes, might be used by the working classes, is recommended by medical men, would save expensive apparatus for bathing, and would be a powerful promoter of health by promoting cleanliness.

"About ten years ago, some people who were coming over from Ireland to Liverpool in a steam-packet lost their lives entirely because the captain of the vessel did not consider how dangerous it is to breathe the breath over again. As the captain saw that a storm was coming on, he ordered all the passengers to go below into the cabin. Now this cabin was much too small for all the persons that were crowded into it; and when they were all down, the captain thoughtlessly ordered the hatches or openings at the top to be fastened down and the entrance to be close shut. Of course no fresh air could get in, and so the poor passengers had to breathe over and over again the same air. Their sufferings were dreadful, and they tried all they could to get out. At last one of them forced his way up to the deck and told the mate how the passengers were being suffocated. When the mate went down, he found that 70 were dead and many were dying. Those who survived had fever."—P. 8.

Sound information and good advice are given respecting the teeth. Many diseases are connected with indigestion, and indigestion is connected with the unclean and improper condition of the teeth.

"The enamel is liable to decay if it is not kept perfectly clean. Any little

bits of food left sticking about our teeth soon become putrid and eat into the enamel, just as rust eats into iron; then, when the enamel is gone, the rest of the tooth soon decays, and we have to suffer the dreadful pain of toothache as well as losing our teeth.

"If you had a beautiful knife or pair of scissors given to you, should you not think yourself very foolish if you let them get spoiled with rust for want of wiping them clean after you had used them? We are much more foolish if we neglect to wash and brush and keep quite clean this nice case of instruments that has been given us for our use and health and comfort every day of our lives. The knives and forks that we use at dinner we know ought always to be well washed afterwards; but it is worse even than putting away the knives and forks dirty to leave dirty these living implements in our mouths.

"The teeth should be well cleaned with a tooth-brush and water every night before going to bed, and again in the morning—at any rate every morning. There is nothing so disgusting to look at as dirty teeth; and besides they make the breath smell disagreeable. Children often destroy their teeth by constantly eating unwholesome things, such as pastry and sweetmeats and unripe fruits. If too many of these are eaten, the stomach becomes disordered, and a disordered stomach usually makes the teeth rotten."—P. 16.

From the living blood are built up all the living tissues of the body, and the waste repaired and the strength renewed. The author does not go out of her way to be always pointing to marvels in the exquisite art of nature's works, but on proper occasions she does not fail to appeal to that faculty of wonder so strong in all young minds.

"Can anything be more wonderful than that dead flesh and dead vegetables and water and bread and substances that have no life in themselves should, when once taken into our body, turn into living flesh, living bone, living skin! And is it not also most wonderful that all the different kinds of food that we eat, whether it is a piece of beef or a piece of bread, whether it is a cupful of milk or a handful of gooseberries—all turn into just the same kind of living fluid! The piece of beef contains much *more* nourishment than the gooseberries, but exactly the same kind of blood is made from both.

"The stomach begins the work of digestion by changing the food into a grey-coloured, pulpy substance called chyme.

"The stomach looks something like a large leathern bottle with two openings,—one for the food to come in at down the gullet, and the other for the digested food or chyme to go out into the intestines. The stomach of a man will hold about three pints."—P. 26.

After a sufficient meal, the stomach requires to be let alone for five or six hours before putting anything more into it. Children require to be fed at shorter intervals, but the sensation of real, unmistakeable hunger is a good, wholesome one, which upgrown persons should feel at least once or twice a day. Hunger is a short illness occurring at stated intervals, and which may be most pleasantly cured every day. We remember writing in our school copy-books, "Few die of hunger—a hundred thousand of surfeits." In order to enjoy the luxury of being hungry with a real and natural hunger, one must work at something which taxes the muscular system, or take exercise in some way which shall be an equivalent for work. The idler cannot enjoy the true relish of food.

"It is better, therefore, if we can, to eat a good meal at once, and then wait some hours; and not to be constantly eating little bits and scraps.

"Little children want feeding oftener than grown-up people. They take less at a time, and they are hungry again sooner. But it is better for them

to be kept from eating till they are hungry, and it is a bad practice to be always giving them something to eat to amuse them and to keep them quiet, as some mothers and nurses do, who do not like to take the trouble of keeping them good-tempered by better means.

"By this constant eating, the child will lose its appetite for the proper meals; his stomach will most likely become weak, and it will be dainty about its food, and perhaps sickly and fretful, and so will give its mother a great deal more trouble in the end than if she had not spoilt it by this sort of over-indulgence.

"A poor ragged beggar-woman, with a child in her arms, once begged at a house-door for something to eat, as she said her child was starving. The lady of the house brought the child a piece of bread and butter; but the child pushed it away and began to cry. The lady asked what was the matter. 'Oh, ma'am!' said the woman, 'you see the poor darling never will eat bread and butter unless there's some sugar on it.' The lady put some sugar on it, but she thought it a sad pity that a woman who was obliged to beg her bread had made her child so dainty."—P. 33.

Lesson 13th bears a very stimulating title; it is called "A Peep into the Stomach;" and, in language so simple that a child may understand it, conveys information that may profit older people.

"You will perhaps wonder how people have been able to find out what goes on in the stomach, since we cannot look in and see. About thirty-seven years ago, a strange accident that happened to a young man in Canada actually enabled an American physician, Dr. Beaumont, to look into a living stomach and see what goes on.

"The name of this young man was Alexis St. Martin, and he had a hole made in his stomach by the discharge of a gun which went off only at about a yard's distance from him. The young man was very ill, and suffered a great deal of pain for about a year after the accident; but at last, through the skill and care of Dr. Beaumont, he got well again; but the hole in his stomach, which was nearly as large as a half-crown, never closed. Dr. Beaumont was thus able to look inside, and he has written a book in which he tells all that he saw and found out about the digestion of the food. He saw, amongst other things, that when a mouthful of food was swallowed, the stomach closed upon it directly, and by its churning motion spread it all over the inside, so that the gastric juice mixed with every part; and as soon as it had done this, the stomach opened wide again the passage into the gullet, ready for the next mouthful. If the next mouthful came down too soon and before the passage was open, the stomach squeezed up the opening still more tightly to prevent its opening. If it was *forced* to open too soon by the mouthfuls coming down too fast one after another, the motion of the stomach was seen to get irregular and disturbed, and the food did not digest well."—P. 38.

We ought not to omit to state that at the end of each chapter or lesson questions with answers are appended, so as to call attention to the leading principles taught. The teacher who properly uses this little manual will insensibly but irresistibly instil into the minds of children the perception that the living universe is governed by divine, universal and invariable laws; thus counteracting a wide-spread but silly and superstitious notion that no laws are divine, that no principles are invested with the highest authority, unless they are found written in a book, expressed in human language. By dwelling on the facts and principles involved in our own living frames, the habit may be early formed of studying the works of nature, using eyes, ears and understanding, and passing by nothing as too trivial for notice. The importance of little things is a lesson that needs to be often impressed on the youthful mind.

And the familiar and ever-recurring facts of our own bodies seem well adapted to convey that lesson. Every one now-a-days is aware of the importance of pure air, clean water, bathing, a skin in good order, &c.

"Of late years, clever men who have given themselves a great deal of trouble to find out how the poor can be saved from so much suffering and illness, have invented ways of building houses, so that enough fresh air is let into them without their being cold and damp; and factories, school-rooms and hospitals built in this way are not the close, wretched places they used to be. Houses for the poor are beginning to be built in the same way; and we may hope that in some years' time every working man may find a house to live in where the air can be kept pure, at the same time that it is warm and comfortable.

"Here we see how useful knowledge may be made, and how much the men who think and contrive can help those who have to labour with their hands more than their heads. There was once a time in England when the people were content to live in huts made of mud or clay, with no fire-places, chimneys or windows, and with only a hole in the roof to let the smoke out, and a hole at the side to serve as entrance and to let the air and light in. Now in these days, thanks to those who have used their brains well for the good of others, the cottage of the poorest man has more comforts in it than the palace of the king some hundred years ago. But in whatever way houses are built, and whether they belong to the rich or the poor, the comfort and health inside them depend a great deal upon the sort of people who live in them. We may go into many a poor man's house and find it more sweet and clean and pleasant to live in than some very grand houses where there are plenty of servants to do the work and plenty of money to spend. And we may go also into many houses, big and little, where the bad air and sickening smells almost drive us out again, because the people who live in them are dirty in their habits and ignorant of the value of pure air.

"If you ever grow up to have homes and families of your own, and have very little money to spend upon food and clothing and other comforts, you can still make the best of these two cheap luxuries, fresh air and water. You can change the air constantly in your bed-rooms and other rooms; even in winter time you can open the windows at least once a day, when there is no one there to take cold from it; and you can keep your houses clean, and your skins and clothes clean, and clear away quickly everything that is dirty and that can taint the air; so that at least you and your children may have wholesome air to breathe, if they cannot have many other things that they need." P. 73.

A. M.

The Hills and Plains of Palestine, with Illustrations and Descriptions. By Miss L. M. Cubley. Small folio. Pp. 56. London—Day and Son. 1860.

This beautiful volume was the result of a visit to the Holy Land, in the latter months of 1853, by the accomplished authoress. She was led there by the desire of co-operating in a benevolent scheme which had in view the raising the condition of the poor Jewesses in Jerusalem. The sketches which are reproduced in this volume are executed with admirable taste, are evidently as truthful as they are beautiful, and are invaluable to those who wish to make up for the want of personal inspection of the Holy Land by the delineations of art. The descriptions which accompany the plates are extracts from Miss Cubley's diary and letters. They have not, however, the power and interest of the engravings.

INTELLIGENCE.

MEETING AT OXFORD TO INAUGURATE THE STATUE OF DR. PRIESTLEY IN THE UNIVERSITY MUSEUM.

The erection of the new Museum at Oxford is an event which must command the approbation of the wise and good. Most commendable is the spirit in which the authorities of the University have entered on, and to a considerable extent fulfilled, their generous purpose of aiding the study of natural science and doing honour to the memory of the great founders and improvers of scientific knowledge. Liberal as the supply of funds has been by the University to the Delegacy to whom the work is entrusted, it has been found necessary to appeal to private generosity to supply the interior ornaments of the building. The appeal is being well answered. Already five statues have been presented by the Queen, viz., those of Bacon, Galileo, Newton, Leibnitz and Oersted; the Bachelors and Undergraduates have furnished the statues of Aristotle and Cuvier; Mr. Ruskin has given that of Hippocrates; the Marquis of Lothian that of Davy; the Rev. F. W. Hope, D.C.L., that of Linnæus; Mr. Boulton that of Watt; Mr. H. Vaughan that of Harvey; the Freemasons of the province of Oxfordshire that of Euclid. Our pages have already detailed the proceedings which led to the provision of a statue of Priestley. It was a happy circumstance that the zeal of the London Committee, ably seconded by that of Mr. Stephens, the sculptor to whom they entrusted the work, succeeded in procuring and erecting the statue in its appointed place, at the S.W. corner of the Museum, between the statues of Aristotle and Davy, in time for the thirtieth meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. The statue naturally attracted a large amount of attention from the numerous visitors in Oxford. At the series of brilliant soirées held in the Museum, it was again and again the subject of remark, and gave general satisfaction, but especially to those who were familiar by report and the help of busts and pictures with the features and expression of the great philosopher. It was thought desirable to mark the occasion by a social gathering during the week of the scientific congress, and Tuesday, July 3, was the day selected. On that occasion a large party assembled at breakfast in the Star Hotel, composed of the ladies and gentlemen whose names follow:

The Baron Anca, of Palermo; N. Arnott, Esq., M.D., Mrs. Arnott; Thos. Ashton, Esq., M.D., Manchester; Rev. R. Brook Aspland, M.A.; B. C. Brodie, Esq., Professor of Chemistry in the University of Oxford and President of the Chemical Section; Rev. Samuel Bache, Birmingham; G. Bowdler Buckton, Esq., F.R.S., London; Eddowes Bowman, Esq., Manchester; Mary Carpenter, Bristol; J. L. Cappitain, Esq., London; Edward Cotton, Esq., London; John Davy, Esq., M.D., F.R.S., Ambleside; John W. Draper, Esq., M.D., Professor of Chemistry, University, New York; Rev. David Davis, Norwich; Rd. Dowden, Esq., Cork; J. C. Darbishire, Esq., Rivington; Hugh Falconer, Esq., M.D., F.R.S., F.L.S., London; G. C. Foster, Esq., of Sabden and Exeter College; William Francis, Esq., London; Frank Fellows, Esq.; John Gibbs, Esq., Tamworth; J. Stuart Glennie, Esq.; H. Hatch, Esq., Oxford; W. Charles Henry, Esq., M.D., F.R.S., Haffield; Jas. Heywood, Esq., F.R.S., London; Robt. Heywood, Esq., Bolton; Rev. Thos. Hincks, F.L.S., Leeds; Leonard Horner, Esq., F.R.S., London, President of Geological Society; R. Vernon Harcourt, Esq., Scholar of Christchurch, Oxford, and Secretary of Chemical Section; Miss E. Vernon Harcourt; Rev. Edward Higginson, Swansea; Rev. William James, Bristol; Rev. John Kenrick, M.A., York; Rev. Edmund Kell, M.A., Southampton; Rev. Thomas Kirkman, M.A., F.R.S., Rector of Croft; J. D. Liveing, Esq., M.A., Oxford, Secretary of the Chemical Section; John Lee, Esq., LL.D., F.S.A., Aylesbury; Arthur Lupton, Esq., Leeds; Ivie Mackie, Esq., Mayor of Manchester; James M'Connel, Esq., Manchester, Mrs. M'Connel; Chas. Moore, Esq., F.G.S., Bath; Herbert New, Esq., Evesham; Dennison Nayler, Esq., Altringham; Follet Osler, Esq., Birmingham; Rev. B. Price, F.R.S., Sedleian Professor, Oxford; Mr. H. D. Pochin, Salford; W. O. Priestley, Esq., M.D., London; Wm. Russell, Esq., and Arthur Ryland, Esq., Birmingham; John Shuttleworth, Esq., Manchester, Mrs. Shuttleworth; Brooke Smith, Esq., Birmingham; E. B. Stephens, Esq., London; Professor Verdet, Paris; Rev. Robert Walker, Professor of Natural Philosophy and one of the Sub-delegates of the Museum; Rev. G. Walker; Chas. Wheatstone, Esq., F.R.S., Professor of Experimental Philosophy, King's College, London; James Yates, Esq., F.R.S., &c., Highgate, Mrs. Yates; Dr. Zumpt, Berlin.

The chair was filled by Professor Brodie, at whose right hand sat Dr. Davy, brother

of the late Sir Humphry Davy, and Dr. W. Charles Henry; and on his left, Professor Walker, one of the Sub-delegacy, and Professor Price, of Oxford. The vice-chair was filled by Mr. James Yates.

In opening the business, the CHAIRMAN said, however interesting they might be, their proceedings must necessarily, in deference to other duties which would soon call them away, be very brief, but he could not allow the occasion to pass over without making a few observations. And first of all he wished to offer his own thanks, and those of the University to which he belonged, to those gentlemen who had combined to enrich and adorn their Museum with the statue of Dr. Priestley. The two facts which had occasioned their meeting that day were in themselves sufficiently remarkable: first, that a place was assigned in the Museum to the statue of Dr. Priestley; and next, that a body of gentlemen were so promptly found willing to undertake the duty of placing the statue there. These things were satisfactory. They indicated the extinction of a great deal of party feeling; they told them that many unworthy sentiments had altogether died out. Dr. Priestley was a man of wonderful versatility. He was a great philosopher; but, in addition, he was an active politician and he was an eminent theologian. He distinguished himself not only in the calm pursuits of philosophy, but in a variety of other pursuits, in some of which the opinions and feelings of mankind are particularly excitable and sensitive. It required the lapse of a generation or two before such a man could take his rightful position. But even after the lapse of years a truly great man seldom received the honour that was his due; when his claims were recognized, he still received the homage of only half the race whom his wisdom benefited. We hold in the highest honour the memory of PRIESTLEY. He was the true founder of Pneumatic Chemistry. His name is honourably recorded in the annals of English science during the latter portion of the last century, a period marked by many great and brilliant discoveries. Amongst the names of those to whom early chemical science is indebted—Black, Cavendish, Lavoisier—we can place none higher than that of Priestley. To shew that reverence for Priestley's philosophical character was with him no new sentiment, he would read to them (at the suggestion of a member of the Committee) a passage from a lecture which he had formerly delivered in that University. A friend had remarked to him in regard to that lecture, after its delivery, that it was the first time the name of Priestley had ever been mentioned in Oxford with praise. This was not strictly true; for he thought his predecessor in the chair of Chemistry, Dr. Daubeny, had not failed to render justice to the merits of Priestley.

"Without a knowledge of gases, a true theory of chemistry was impossible. The data did not exist for its construction. The very facts were unknown for which it should account. No knowledge on this subject was bequeathed to chemists by the alchemists; their discovery was reserved for a late period in the science, and immediately upon this discovery the true method of chemistry was invented.

"Up to the time of Priestley only two gases were known: hydrogen, an imperfect knowledge of which, under the name of inflammable air, had descended from early times; and carbonic acid, the discovery of which was announced by Black, then a young man of twenty-one, in the year 1752, in his inaugural discourse at Glasgow. And it was only recently that chemists had become acquainted with the properties even of these gases. No methods had been known for their collection and examination, and no exact experiments had been made with them. About this time an apparatus of an extreme simplicity was invented for the collection of gases, which goes under the name of the pneumatic trough, and which is used at the present day without any essential variation in its construction. By means of this apparatus, Priestley made a series of more remarkable discoveries in chemistry than had ever yet been made by one man, discoveries which astonished Europe and changed the whole aspect of science.

"On the 1st of August, 1774,—let us preserve the record of a day so memorable in the history of mankind,—Priestley discovered oxygen gas. Nor did this discovery stand alone. Priestley also discovered nitrogen, the second constituent of air. He discovered the binoxide of nitrogen, by means of which the first analysis of air was made. He discovered hydrochloric acid gas, ammonia, sulphurous acid, oxygen, the crown of these discoveries, the last of all. Strange to say, these discoveries formed but a little episode in his life; he does not appear as a scientific observer until thirty-two years of age, and his researches extend only through ten years. When in future ages men reckon up the names of the benefactors of their race, the names of those who laid the foundations of the sciences by which the condition of humanity has been raised, among the most famous will be found the name of Priestley."

What he had now read to them had this

recommendation. His words were not a mere éloge of Priestley, prepared with a view of pleasing an assembly of his friends and admirers, but they were the genuine sentiments of one speaking on behalf of science and desirous of doing honour to a true philosopher. He would conclude his remarks by proposing from the chair, and he did it from his heart, the following resolution : "That the thanks of the meeting be given to Mr. Yates and the other members of the Committee for their zealous and successful labours in erecting the statue of Dr. Priestley."

Dr. Davy, rose, he said, with great pleasure to second the resolution. Little need be added to the just and forcible sentiments to which they had just listened from their Chairman. He must, however, express his warm admiration of the statue which the Committee had caused to be executed, and which was one of the many beautiful ornaments of the new Museum. When he (Dr. Davy) was invited as a guest to that breakfast, he felt it to be a great honour. He remembered with great interest a letter addressed to his brother, the late Sir Humphry Davy. That letter was written in the first year of the present century from the United States, to which Dr. Priestley was under the necessity of flying from the disgraceful persecution of which he was the object in his own country, his house and library and apparatus at Birmingham having been destroyed by a ferocious mob.

"Northumberland, U.S.,
Oct. 31, 1801.

"Sir,—I have read with admiration your excellent publications, and have received much instruction from them. It gives me peculiar satisfaction that, as I am now far advanced in life and cannot expect to do much more, I shall leave so able a fellow-labourer of my own country in the great field of experimental chemistry. As old an experimenter as I am, I was near forty before I made any experiments on the subject of air, and then without, in a manner, any previous knowledge of chemistry. This I picked up as I could, and as I found occasion for it from books. I was also without apparatus, and laboured under many other disadvantages. But my unexpected success induced the friends of science to assist me, and then I wanted for nothing. I rejoice that you are so young a man, and perceiving the ardour with which you begin your career, I have no doubt of your success."

He could not but think it most remarkable that a man at Dr. Priestley's time of life, with little previous knowledge of chemistry, should have achieved such brilliant discoveries. It seemed almost as if he had been inspired. Certainly, looking at his means and previous acquirements, no one could have anticipated the result. He seconded the resolution with much cordiality. It was unanimously adopted.

Mr. Yates, in acknowledging the vote so handsomely proposed by the Chairman and seconded by Dr. Davy, expressed the great delight which that meeting gave him. To see such an assemblage of distinguished men, and to hear the noble sentiments which had been uttered, was a most agreeable close of the labours of the Committee. It was not his purpose to dilate on the great merits of Priestley. Mr. Yates then described the circumstances which had led to the formation of the Committee, and mentioned with respect the name of Mr. Kent Kingdon, of Exeter, to whom belonged the merit of having suggested and commenced the subscription. He (Mr. Y.) regretted that Mr. K. was not present, but the company would be gratified to hear a passage from a letter lately received in respect to the statue: "I am quite satisfied; Priestley's character and attainments are now publicly recognized by the highest seat of learning in the world. The exiled from his country is received back again, and takes his place with the selected great and wise of all nations." The proposal to raise the statue had found favour with men of all sects and parties. It had an immediate and gratifying response from scientific men. At Birmingham, where the memory of Priestley was reverently cherished, the plan was warmly adopted, and he desired to mention the assistance given him by the Rev. Samuel Bache, the minister who now occupied the pulpit of Priestley. From Birmingham and other places he had received subscriptions from persons of various ranks, —some with no particular pretensions to science, but persons who knew how to respect genius, and who loved virtue wherever it was found. He was pleased to observe the presence of the Sculptor who had with such zeal and singular ability carried out the wishes of the Committee. They had furnished him with the best materials, and the result was an admirable likeness. In the statue, Priestley appeared in the ordinary costume of his age. In the pulpit, he had a different costume. Mr. Yates further alluded to the painted portraits, busts, medallions and engravings from which Mr. Stephens had worked, and alluded to the pleasure it had given him, at a recent soirée of the Royal Society, to exhibit at Burlington House these various memorials to Sir B.

Brodie, the President of that Society (the father of their Chairman) and to his distinguished guests. Mr. Yates then delivered with admirable propriety the noted tribute borne to Dr. Priestley by his neighbour, acquaintance and friend, Dr. Parr, and published in an Address to the Inhabitants of Birmingham :

"Let Dr. Priestley, indeed, be confuted where he is mistaken. Let him be exposed where he is superficial. Let him be repressed where he is dogmatical. Let him be rebuked where he is censorious. But let not his attainments be depreciated, because they are numerous almost without a parallel. Let not his talents be ridiculed, because they are superlatively great. Let not his morals be vilified, because they are correct without austerity, and exemplary without ostentation—because they present even to common observers the innocence of a Hermit and the simplicity of a Patriarch, and because a philosophic eye will at once discover in them the deep-fixed root of virtuous principle, and the solid trunk of virtuous habit."

Mr. Yates concluded by proposing a vote of thanks to Professor Brodie for his valuable assistance as the Chairman of the meeting.

Rev. John Kenrick then rose, at the request of the Committee, to propose this resolution — "That the thanks of this meeting be given to the Authorities of the University of Oxford connected with the new Museum, for their justice alike to Science and to the memory of a distinguished Philosopher, in spontaneously awarding a site for a Statue of Dr. Priestley, the Father of Pneumatic Chemistry." Having read the resolution, he said—I consider it a high honour to have been asked to move this resolution—an undeserved honour indeed ; for though feeling a warm interest in the object of this meeting, I have not taken a part in any of the preliminary proceedings. The University of Oxford has long stood pre-eminent among the literary institutions of the country, for classical scholarship ; its superiority in this respect is recognized as fully by those who are prevented by religious scruples from availing themselves of its advantages, as by those who are educated within its walls. You, Sir, in conjunction with the gentleman who sits on your right hand,* and I will add my old and valued friend, Professor Phillips, are raising it in science to the same eminence which it has occupied in philology. And by the act which we celebrate to-day, Oxford is adding to its former honours, what I regard as the crowning glory of all, theological liberality.

When I have looked on the portraits of Dr. Priestley, and thought of the treatment which he had received at the hands of his countrymen, I have been reminded of the lines in which the celebrated Dutch scholar, Peter Burman the younger, apostrophized his native country, as he stood before a portrait of Hugo Grotius :

— Anne ideo tantum peperisti patria civem,
Ut fieres nato dira noverca tuo ?

Did his country bring forth such an illustrious citizen, only to treat him with harshness and injustice ? With very different feelings I have contemplated the interesting statue which has been placed in your beautiful Museum. It is a recognition of the rank in science which Priestley is entitled to hold, but which has long been withheld from him by theological prejudice. In the consolatory verses which Mrs. Barbauld addressed to him in December, 1792, she says,

— Well thou canst afford
To give large credit for that debt of fame
Thy country owes thee.

The debt has indeed long been over-due. Happily, in regard to such debts, there is no statute of limitations, and we may say that this day it is paid with compound interest.

Dr. W. O. Priestley said that he had much pleasure in seconding the resolution proposed by Mr. Kenrick, and did so in his double capacity as a relative of Dr. Priestley and as a member of the Committee for erecting his statue. He had hoped that some of the nearer relatives of Priestley would have been present on the occasion. Those assembled were probably aware that granddaughters of that celebrated man were resident in England, and he felt a considerable amount of disappointment that they were not present to witness the cordial tribute paid to his memory. He might, however, in the name of the family, be permitted to say, that it afforded them the greatest gratification to find Dr. Priestley's merits as a scientific man and philosopher at length so fully and so publicly acknowledged ; and it must be admitted by all as a most remarkable indication of the advance of liberality in our days, that a statue should be placed in the Museum of the University of Oxford in honour of one who, little more than fifty years ago, would more probably have been burnt in effigy, or indeed might have run some chance of being

* The Rev. Robert Walker, Professor of Natural Philosophy and General Secretary of the British Association.

burnt in person, had he presented himself to the University authorities in those days of intolerance.—The scientific labours and discoveries of Priestley were now universally acknowledged to have been of the highest importance, and previous speakers had done ample justice to his scientific merits; but he (Dr. P.) might be allowed to add that he was not less remarkable for his personal amiability and benevolence; and he had no doubt that after a candid review of Priestley's life and works it would be admitted that he was much in advance of his time in his political and religious liberality.—In reference to the excellent work of art placed in the Museum, it would be a gratification for Mr. Stephens and the Committee to know that Mrs. Joseph Parkes, a granddaughter of Dr. Priestley, who retained for him the tenderest affection, and who had an accurate recollection of his appearance during life, had stated the day before, that she was forcibly reminded in the statue of his face and figure; and the only criticism she might be inclined to make was, that he had been clothed by a somewhat more fashionable tailor than usual during his lifetime.

The resolution was unanimously adopted, and Rev. Robert Walker (Professor of Experimental Philosophy, one of the Subdelegacy of the Museum, and General Secretary of the British Association) rose, amid the applause of the company, to acknowledge the vote. As his presence was required elsewhere in the fulfilment of important duties, he would content himself with explaining that when the scheme of the new University Museum was drawn up, and it was resolved to solicit the statues of eminent men, Her Majesty the Queen requested that she might be furnished with a list of the names of those for whom statues were proposed. In obedience to that command, the list of persons most distinguished in science which had been made public was drawn up. In that list the name of Priestley naturally found a place. No difficulty whatever was made to the proposal. He was entitled to his place of honour among the great founders and improvers of natural knowledge.

Mr. James Heywood, on rising to propose the thanks of the company to the Sculptor, said that he believed Mr. Stephens had worked almost night and day to complete the work in time for the meeting of the British Association. The statue was, he believed, as admirable as a likeness as it was as a work of art. He was pleased to think that relatives of his own had been intimate personal friends of Dr. Priestley. He had often heard his mother, a daughter of Dr. Perceval, say that Dr. Priestley was a man equally remarkable for kindness of heart and elegance of mind. The liberality which the University of Oxford had shewn in this matter was very gratifying. That liberality began to dawn here some time ago. He remembered, when the British Association met at Birmingham, conversing with the late Sir R. Harry Inglis (a man who well represented the University in its better and in its worse qualities), who proposed to him to go and visit the remains of the library of Dr. Priestley which were preserved on the shelves of the Philosophical Society. He went to see those books as the remains of a distinguished and injured man of science. He rejoiced that the statue, for which he desired to thank Mr. Stephens, had a place in so grand and beautiful a building. He trusted that the Museum would promote, as it would greatly facilitate, the study of natural science at Oxford.

Dr. W. C. Henry, in seconding the resolution, alluded admiringly to the discriminative tribute to the merits of Priestley which had been read to them from the Chair. He would not attempt to add a word on that subject; but he might remind the founders of the British Association that at their first meeting, held many years ago at York, his late father (Dr. Henry) had read a paper in which he bore testimony to Dr. Priestley's character as a philosopher, and to the extent and value of his scientific discoveries.

Mr. Stephens, in acknowledging the vote, said that it gratified him not a little to know that the statue which he had created was thought worthy of the place where it now stood, and of the great philosopher in whose honour it was erected.

The Chairman, in rising to dissolve the meeting—the time for which could not be longer delayed—said that he had always considered that amongst the numerous advantages and benefits of science, the greatest of all was the aspiring direction thereby given to the human mind, and he was disposed to set this advantage above even the direct results of scientific inquiry. It is in some respects a humiliating consideration that men should regard it as a thing of merit, that they are not unwilling to pay the tribute of great honour to a man like Priestley. The improved state of feeling in this country was doubtless due in some measure to the greater attention paid to science and the better appreciation of the value of philosophical investigations. The recognition of the great and varied merits of Priestley could not be longer delayed. It is impossible for any man who catches the genuine spirit of science to be

intolerant. We have to do with the exact and minute observation of facts, and with just reasoning on the basis of them. Knowing the difficulties which meet us when dealing with material subjects, we can the better form an idea of the difficulty of attaining to unmixed truth when dealing with subtler speculations. The spirit of science is a spirit of religious and political tolerance.—The Chairman then acknowledged the vote of thanks to himself which had been previously proposed and carried, and in dissolving the meeting asked those present to accompany him to the Museum to take a view together of the statue, the inauguration of which was the occasion of their assembling that day.

Our readers will, we doubt not, appreciate the importance and significance of this meeting. A few days after it, the 69th anniversary of the riots of Birmingham occurred. How great the change! Then, clergy, magistrates, and even the sovereign, looked on without disgust at the wrongs and insults offered to one of the wisest and best of his race. Now, the University which embodies the best learning and the highest social status of the country, and of which the Heir-apparent is a member, delights to do honour to the philosopher and the patriot driven during his life an exile from his ungrateful country. And the event of placing his statue in a new and beautiful Temple dedicated to Science, is inaugurated by men who are themselves honoured members of the British Association. When all the circumstances are borne in mind, the meeting which we have now reported may be regarded as a national expiation of a wrong done to one of the excellent of the earth.

SOUTHERN UNITARIAN SOCIETY.

The above Society held its fifty-ninth annual meeting at the Presbyterian chapel, Newbury, Berkshire, on Wednesday, July 11. The Rev. Henry Hawkes introduced the service, and the Rev. William James preached an admirable sermon on the duty of seeking for and earnestly adhering to Christian truth. At the business meeting of the Society, the Rev. Richard Shelley presided, and the Rev. Edmund Kell read the report. After alluding to the ordinary operations of the Society during the year and its future prospects, the report stated that the Society had petitioned the House of Commons against the obnoxious religious profession clause in the Census Bill. It also recommended an address to our Unitarian brethren in America on the subject of Slavery. The report concluded—"Brethren, would that we could report that we had effected more good during the course of the past year! If we had half that noble zeal which raised the early followers of the Saviour—fishermen of Galilee, unlettered peasants, though they were—to such exalted grade as sons of God and heirs of heaven, we should have done far, far more good than we have even aimed to effect. Do we not believe that we are labourers in the great field of human philanthropy, that we are acting under the direct teaching of Jehovah and of Jesus? But where is the impulse, the effort, commensurate to the importance of our charge? When shall we give ourselves to our heavenly mission as though we were toiling for an eternal world? When shall we feel that our noontide strength and our worldly gains should be given with more unstinted devotion in our crucified Saviour's cause? Our time, our wealth—what are they? We can carry neither beyond the confines of the tomb. But our Father's approving smile for the right use of these talents committed to us shall bring us Heaven's bliss through eternal ages."

The reception of the report was moved by Rev. H. E. Howse, seconded by Sir John Bowring.

J. T. Hart, Esq., moved and Rev. E. Kell seconded a cordial vote of thanks to Rev. William James for his admirable discourse.

Rev. H. Hawkes moved and Mr. Ilsley seconded—"That deeply deploring the existence of Slavery, and the enormous and accumulating evils therewith connected, this Society, desiring to express their opinions upon the subject to the Unitarian Christian churches throughout the United States, authorize a Committee, consisting of Rev. E. Kell, Rev. R. Shelley, Rev. H. Hawkes, B. W. Carter, Esq., and Dr. Watson, to draw up a suitable address for the purpose and to sign it in their behalf, and send it to the Secretary of the American Unitarian Association."

Mr. Edwell moved and Mr. Heathall seconded a vote of thanks to the Secretary and Committee.

A large party of the members and friends of the Society dined together at the White Hart hotel, Sir John Bowring in the chair. We regret our space will not allow us to give an abstract of the eloquent addresses delivered by the Chairman in proposing the sentiments of the Queen, Civil and Religious Liberty, and Prosperity to the Southern Unitarian Society,—addresses which will long be remembered by those who had the gratification of listening to them.—Rev. E. Kell proposed, Prosperity to the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, and their best thanks to J. T.

Hart, Esq., who was present as a deputation from that Society; to which that gentleman responded, explaining the nature and objects of the Association.—Rev. W. James, on his health being drunk as preacher of the day, proposed, "The Members of the House of Commons who signed the Memorial to Lord Palmerston against the obnoxious and inquisitorial clause in the Census Bill."—The Chairman proposed the health of the minister of the congregation, which was responded to by Rev. R. Shelley.—Mr. White, of Southampton, proposed "the Press," and Rev. H. Hawkes the health of the Chairman, which was enthusiastically received.

The meeting having adjourned for a short time, met at five o'clock in the Town Hall, where about one hundred persons sat down to tea, Sir John Bowring again presiding. After a most interesting opening address, the following sentiments were proposed with appropriate remarks:

"The prospects and duties of Unitarian Christians at the present juncture"—by Rev. W. James.

"The Missionary spirit! May its influence be felt throughout the Unitarian church, and soon extend itself to those fields of labour which are now opening in foreign lands especially to Unitarian Christians!"—proposed by Rev. E. Kell.

"The true principles of Christian Freedom! May their influence soon be diffused throughout all nations!"—by Rev. Henry Hawkes.

"Unity of spirit amidst diversity of religious opinion"—spoken to by Rev. R. Shelley.

"Thanks to the friends who have made arrangements for the meeting"—responded to by Mr. Ilsley.

"Welcome to our friends from a distance"—replied to by Mr. Simpson, of Southampton.

Rev. E. Kell proposed, "Our cordial and respectful thanks to the Chairman, whose eminent services on the occasion had contributed so much to the gratification of the meeting," which was acknowledged by Sir John Bowring.—A hymn was then sung by the assembly, and the proceedings of this interesting day were brought to a close by a prayer from Rev. W. James.

E. K.

NORTH-MIDLAND UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

The anniversary meeting of this Association was held in Sheffield on Tuesday, July 3rd. The anniversary service in the Upper chapel was introduced by the Rev. Francis Bishop, of Chesterfield, and the sermon was preached by the Rev. A. W. Worthington, B.A., of Mansfield. In a clear and vigorous discourse the preacher explained the position of liberal Christians in regard to the rule of faith, and after giving a brief outline of the views in which Unitarians are agreed, he sought to shew their intimate connection with virtue, piety and charity, and earnestly enforced the duty of missionary efforts.

At the close of the service, the annual meeting of the Sunday-school branch of the Asociation was held in the large school-room, which was well filled, a large number of teachers being present from various parts of the district. Rev. F. Bishop was called to the chair; and after the general report had been read by the Secretary, T. E. Paget, Esq., of Leicester, reports from nearly all the schools connected with the Association were read, as well as several reports from the Visitors appointed at the last meeting, of the visits they had paid to various schools during the year. The tone of this meeting was marked by an earnest and practical spirit, giving rise to a pleasant and useful conference.

About 150 ladies and gentlemen afterwards dined together at the Cutlers' Hall, under the presidency of R. Jackson, Esq., Master Cutler. At this meeting the report of the North-Midland Unitarian Village Missionary Society, which was of a satisfactory and encouraging character, was read by the Secretary, the Rev. Rees L. Lloyd, of Belper, and addresses were delivered by the Chairman, Mr. Hobson, Revds. C. Coe, A. W. Worthington, B.A., Francis Bishop, J. Page Hopps, Brooke Herford, Mr. Williamson, of Belper, Dr. Holland, of Sheffield, Rev. J. J. Bishop, B.A., P. W. Clayden, Alderman Fisher, and Revds. T. R. Elliott and W. Birks.

The proceedings of the anniversary were altogether of an interesting and hopeful character, and the local arrangements were such as to reflect credit on the zealous minister and congregation of the place of meeting. It was resolved to hold the next anniversary at Nottingham.

REV. J. C. GANGOOLY AND THE UNITARIAN MISSIONS IN INDIA.

At the present day, all subjects connected with our Indian empire are watched and examined with an interest perhaps hardly equalled since the days of Clive or Hastings. The horrors of the mutiny, the change of the sovereignty, have made Englishmen recognize, as they never recognized before, the solemn responsibilities of our position as rulers of more than a hundred millions of men brought up in circumstances en-

tirely different from our own, under various forms of faith, speaking various languages, and dating back those languages and laws far beyond the time when Christian civilization began to dawn upon the world. We cannot hope to govern those races upon the same methods as we rule at home over an European people. Without a knowledge, and that no superficial one, of their real wants, and the best methods of meeting those wants, all our endeavours to civilize and improve the native population must fail. Without at all wishing to disparage the valuable and humanizing influence which has been exercised by the missions of the various Societies who maintain agents in India, it cannot be denied that the converts to Christianity are but few and far between; and we cannot hope for any real advancement of the Hindoos till the faith of Hindostan be purified from its varied superstitions and exalted to the simple acceptance of Christ's gospel. Caste, with all its accompaniments, must be destroyed before India can become a progressive nation; and Christianity, as it is presented in general to the Hindoos, has but little power over the mind of the natives, who do not dare to risk the fearful consequences of losing caste for the sake of a faith, the truth of which they cannot recognize, and around which they perceive some of the same objectionable features to which they have been accustomed in their own creed, but which they would rejoice to resign, did something purer and more simple offer itself. While thus at a loss ourselves how to proceed, and hearing with no little interest the accounts which Mr. Hodgson Pratt has brought with him from the East, we have lately had the pleasure of welcoming on our shores a guest who would always have been sure of a hearty reception, but whose presence now seems providential. While the missionary spirit is rising amongst us, and we feel bound to spread abroad those sacred truths which we hold dear, the Rev. J. C. Gangooly has arrived in England, after his two years' residence in the United States, on his way to Calcutta. We trust he will have frequent opportunities of conference with the various Unitarian churches in England, and will be able to turn their missionary zeal into useful channels; and while by his own personal history we take courage, and feel that our past efforts, feeble though they have been, have not been thrown away, we hope that he, strengthened by English sympathy, will go forth to his work among his brethren in the East supported by the knowledge that his labours will be the burden of the prayers of many churches and of many Christian souls throughout this land.

It is possible that the history of this most interesting visitor is not familiar to all our readers, and therefore with the utmost brevity we lay this sketch of him before them.

Jogguth Chundra Gangooly is a native of Bali, a suburb of Calcutta. His family is of the Brahmin caste, of that caste which is dedicated to the service of the innumerable idols of the Hindoo Pantheon,* and the members of which are almost regarded as gods by the lower castes. He is now twenty-four years of age, but has been from his earliest years devoted with the intensest zeal to the study of the literature of his country in which the ancient faith of Brahminism is expounded, to the service of which he had given his whole heart. While thus pursuing his career as a priest, he accidentally met with a Hindoo who had received a packet of tracts from a Christian missionary. Fully persuaded of the truth of his own creed, he took one of these tracts, for the simple purpose of finding out, and then publishing to the world, the errors and flaws which he felt sure it would contain. Fortunately the tract was an extract from the New Testament, containing the greater part of the "Sermon on the Mount." He read and re-read this tract, and to his surprise, instead of discovering anything which he could refute, he found nothing but lessons of such holiness and purity, that his heart was irresistibly drawn towards the Speaker of such divine sentiments. He was impelled to proceed further in his investigation of the faith that thus appealed to everything which was noble in humanity, and after much trouble succeeded in obtaining possession of a copy of the New Testament. To this book he now gave all his time, studying its contents and receiving the lessons which to every unprejudiced mind its sacred pages will impart. When his mind was thus full of Christian thoughts, he called upon a Christian clergyman to obtain from him further instruction on the points which were of interest to him. Instead of receiving satisfaction from this gentleman, the Catechism with its doctrinal teaching was placed before him as a true exposition of Christian principle. The Trinity, the doctrine of Human Depravity and of the vicarious Atonement, were explained to him as the fundamental truths of the Christian religion, and in these he was directed to put his faith if he wished to obtain salvation. Mr. Gangooly has told us a Hindoo story which well expresses the feelings which he experienced when

* The Brahmins recognize no less than thirty-six millions of gods.

these doctrines were first declared to him as Christian truths. "A poor Brahmin, living on the coarsest of coarse food, came from his village to visit a rich friend in Calcutta. On entering the magnificent palace where his friend lived, he was shewn by the servant into a large saloon most gorgeously furnished, and invited to partake of some refreshment. To his utter surprise he found upon the table food of the self-same character that he had in his miserable village home; and being asked why he did not eat, he asked the attendant to wait, and addressed the dish of food before him, 'How is this? Did I not leave thee in my poor unroofed cottage in the village? How is it that thou hast preceded me and arrived here before me?'"

The application is obvious. In his own Brahminical faith he had known a Trinity of the Creator, the Sustainer and the Destroyer; he had known of incarnate gods in the Avatars; the mysteries which the Christian clergyman had required him to believe, they were the very things which had appeared to him repugnant to reason in Brahminism; and in that glorious faith, in Christianity, which in reading the Scriptures had seemed so pure and beautiful, he found again the old absurdities he thought he had left behind.

The catechism and the creeds repelled him, and he lapsed for a time into a pure Theism. Knowing no form of Christianity but that presented in the creeds, he felt himself isolated and separate from every one. He heard, indeed, of Unitarians in England and the United States, and heard of them also as being not Christian, and for communication with them he longed. It was in this state of mind that he became acquainted with our excellent and indefatigable missionary, the Rev. Mr. Dall. From him he received much help. The mist thrown round Christianity by so-called orthodoxy was dispelled, and the pure faith of Unitarian Christianity came like rest to the wounded spirit which had sought peace everywhere, but found it not. Mr. Gangooly became an earnest Unitarian, and, having received such rich blessings himself, determined to devote himself to the great work of preaching the religion he had himself adopted to his countrymen. It was not a light task to be undertaken. He would by baptism lose his caste. He would be a stranger among his kindred and his friends. Even his mother's house would no longer be open for him, and his brethren would not hold intercourse with him. But Christ was his comforter and God gave him courage. He left Calcutta and went to the United States to prepare himself for his great work. There for two years he worked at the various branches of knowledge, to attain which he was the first Brahmin who had ever set foot on American shores. From place to place, too, he went, to tell of the darkness of his native land, and to excite in Christian minds the desire and resolve to help the needy and the benighted heathen. On the 10th of June, 1860, Mr. Gangooly was ordained as a Christian missionary to India in the church of the Rev. E. H. Hale, of Boston. The service, from all the accounts which we have received, must have been very impressive, but especially was the address of the new missionary full of interest. He told his hearers of his conversion, of his repulse by the clergymen, of his gradual conviction of the truth of Unitarianism, and of the plans by which he hoped to bring his brethren among the Brahmins into the fold of Christ. His schemes seem to the writer of these lines full of true wisdom. Like St. Paul, he would not reject the wisdom of the old writers among his countrymen; but to them he would appeal as confirming the great truths taught by Christ, and would point out how the Great Teacher fulfils those wishes which the purest thoughts of Brahmin teachers had suggested. Acknowledging the good already existing in his ancient faith, he would from it lead up to the holier truth of the gospel, and in the very accordance of these two lines of faith would find the highest confirmation for the divine origin of Christianity, which, though first preached to Jews nineteen centuries ago, applies equally well to Brahmins of the present day. We have not time to enter now into further detail of Mr. Gangooly's scheme, but would hurriedly state that he has arrived in England, and preached on Sunday, July 22, at the Renshaw-Street and Hope-Street churches in Liverpool, to congregations which were intensely interested in the services. He pointed out how Unitarianism can alone meet the wants of the Brahmins, and how the man-made creeds repel them; and in the simple manner which is the chief and most charming feature of his preaching, manifested a power and energy which bid us hope great things for his work when, once more amongst his friends, he strives to spread abroad a knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus.

We understand that the collections which are being made in various places after Mr. Gangooly's sermons, are all to be forwarded to London, to the Secretary of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, for the special service of the India Mission, and we trust that the sympathy displayed will prove to Mr. Gangooly how deeply we ap-

preciate the great sacrifices he has made for Christ. Of him it may truly be said that "he has forsaken houses, brethren, sisters, father and mother, wife, children and lands, for Christ's sake." May he also receive an hundred-fold and inherit everlasting life!

MR. GANGOOLY'S ORDINATION AT BOSTON, JUNE 10, 1860.

We take from a recent number of the *Boston Transcript* and of the *Christian Register* a report of the religious service by which Mr. Gangooly before leaving Boston was set apart to the office of a Christian missionary to India. It took place at the church of Rev. E. H. Hale, which was filled by a deeply interested audience.

Rev. Dr. Ellis delivered the sermon. It commenced by referring to the first appearance of Gangooly in this country, when, almost unfriended and alone, he was presented to the Unitarian Association. He spoke of the "instantaneous intelligence" of Gangooly, and how he had repaid the labours of those endeavouring to instruct him in regard to the denominational peculiarities of the United States, an effort about as perplexing as it would have been to obtain from the artizans employed a knowledge of the working plans by which the Tower of Babel was built, after the dispersion and confusion of tongues had occurred.

Mr. Ellis explained the modifications which had taken place in missionary operations in recent years, and commented with pungency upon some of the platform statements of returned missionaries of the American Board. Mr. Scudder, a missionary to Burmah, once described at a public meeting a "night vision" he had respecting the heathen. He fancied he saw three miles of people, stretching over an area a mile wide, constantly marching up to the brink of the pit, and as the advanced column fell over, their places were supplied by new-comers. Notwithstanding this horrible appeal to the sympathies of the audience, which was commended in a leading orthodox organ, the contributions of the entire denomination in the country that year would not have supported a first-class theatre in any of the principal cities for a twelvemonth. Mr. Ellis referred to the fact that the only converted Brahmins who had possessed sufficient zeal to leave their own country in the pursuit of information had embraced the Unitarian faith. If the American Board could have had such a prize as Gangooly, they would have turned every moment of his two years visit here to account, and every word into solid gold for the benefit of the missionary enterprize.

After Mr. Ellis had concluded, Rev. S. H. Winkley delivered an expressive "charge" to the newly-created clergyman, who was then introduced to the audience by Rev. James Freeman Clarke.

We must find room, if possible, for the whole of the very remarkable address of this converted Brahmin.

Rev. Gentlemen and Christian Brethren —Like the apostles of old, you are gathered together here this evening, to bid one God-speed in his journey towards home, and towards the field of his labour. Let me say a few words to you, that if you wholly discredit his personal story, his position, his caste, his birth, and his former relation to that Christianity of which he is now to be a minister, you will clearly see that next to that labourer, to that clergyman, to that servant of Christ who is now at work in India, who, as Ananias said to Paul, said to me, "Receive your sight!" —God has given you, next to him, the privilege of putting your hands upon my head, and bidding me God-speed. It is not a sentimental thing when I say that what Ananias was to Paul, your brother and friend in India was to me. It is not sentimentalism at all. I was born of the priesthood of whose civilization, whose literature, whose philosophy, no human history can date the beginning. I was born to be a priest. My life was passed there, marked and exemplary in some measure, although I don't mean to say it in a spirit of pride. The circumstance which made me to become a Christian was similar to that which made St. Paul a Christian. Although I did not precisely and exactly hold the clothes, or stand by those who killed Stephen, yet, so far as I could, honestly and fairly, I opposed Christianity, and so doing, I believed that I did God service. I need not say, as time would not permit me to do it, anything of the gradual change of my belief and my life; but I will only speak a few words in relation to the circumstances under which I came here, and under which I go out to India, and what are my plans for work when I reach my own home. When I think of my life in India and my life in America, when I think of the first Sabbath when I opened my lips in this church, and this last Sabbath in this country that I open my mouth again, my emotions and feelings know no bounds. I cannot, in a short time, give utterance to those feelings; but I will simply, in a few words, speak of those matters which are nearly connected with my coming from and returning to India.

I came from my home to your country, as a fugitive slave from Brahminism, as an exile, a runaway, privately, and without any friends, and not knowing where I was coming. Trusting in Providence, trusting in Him as a guiding star, I sought your shores, not on account of my poverty, or any intention of staying, but to see and study Christianity in Christian countries, and thereby receive strength and help, that I might go back to India and diffuse those very things among our people which I had received here ; and I am not entirely disappointed. I have learned a great many things, seen a great many things, enjoyed a great many things—things which are purely Christian, as far as human things can be. I came here a weak man, and now go a strong man. I came here helpless, and now go away full of help. I came here a man of sorrow, full of discouragement, and now I go a happy being, and full of hope ; although I know that on my arrival in India, as our brother pictured the scene, the very mother whose tender arms have supported me twenty-one years will not clasp me, not on account of her lack of affection, but the monster superstition has bound her hands and driven them back. Her heart is as kind as ever. She has a heart—a mother's heart—and she is as noble a woman as any I knew in India. She is a Hindoo, indeed ; but if you watched her daily steps, you would immediately say, "I have not seen such faith, no, not in Israel." She is a Christian woman, as far as her origin and religion permit her to be. I go to India, but not to my home. I go to my work, to perform my duty, and that is the best home a man can find. Duty is my home, full of hope to me ; and I go to India as the field of my work and usefulness.

Now my plans are somewhat different, and will be different, from the usual plans which other missionaries take ; and I will give you some reasons why I am going to take a somewhat different course from other missionaries. You know that in our country there is a proverb or saying to this effect, that "I was a patient once, a sick man, now a doctor." So it is with me. I being a Hindoo myself, and brought up a Hindoo, growing under the superstitions of the Hindoos, when now, by the blessing of God, I have thrown them off, and have seen the light of Christianity,—knowing these ills and sufferings, and what the disease is, I know what remedy to apply. The cause of Christ in India suffers a great deal on account of the mistaken earnestness of the Christian missionaries. I do not blame them, for they are good, earnest, devoted men ; but they are prejudiced at home, and they carry their prejudices with them in the work there. They go, as our brother Ellis spoke beautifully of their proceedings—they go to the people, and tell them that anything outside of the Bible is a humbug, and that anything by the name of Hindoo is nonsense. That is a great wrong, and I think that feeling is one hindrance to the cause of Christ in India. You read the reports of the missionaries of the American Board, and of other Boards, and you will find that their converts are always from the low castes ; and although, as a Christian, I do not undervalue or despise the low castes, yet, owing to the position and customs of India, it is a difficult thing to promote Christianity by converting the low castes. Now I see in your papers that you have nominated Lincoln for President, and are going to elect a man to be the first man in this country who belongs to the low caste, whose early life was very obscure—and I hope he will be President, because he is an anti-slavery man. You see that in India the high castes have all the knowledge about religion; and when these missionaries convert a low caste, who knew nothing, who knew nothing even of their own religion, they cannot open their mouth before the high castes. In India, if you convert one of the high castes, you convert ten of the low caste, because, as our saying is, "If you pour water upon the head, you wet the whole body."

I know from personal experience that the Hindoo Scriptures have a great deal of truth. Now what reason have I to say that this Scripture is a humbug, which contains the same doctrines that are taught in the New Testament ? The trouble and the pity is, I am sorry to say, that the Hindoos, having these very sublime truths, wrap them up in coverings ; they have hid these precious truths under a bushel. Now I am going to take these wrappers and coverings off, and take away the bushel, so that every one may see the light and live.

But I do not say that the Hebrew Scriptures will be all that is needed. No ; I go to India to preach "Christ, and him crucified." But I believe, as the apostle Paul says, that "all scripture is given by inspiration of God." Now you can imagine the looks of the original structure by examining the little bricks or tiles that are taken out. You go to Egypt, and you will find some pieces of stone, beautifully carved and ornamented, that seem to have been part of some large building ; and by examining these, you can imagine how magnificent this structure must have been. Now if you go to India, and examine the common sayings of the people, you will be

surprised to see what a splendid religion the Hindoo religion must be. Even the most ignorant women have proverbs that are full of the purest religion. Now I am not going to India to injure their feelings by saying, "Your Scripture is all nonsense, is good for nothing; anything outside of the Old and New Testament is a humbug." No; I tell you I will appeal to the Hindoo philosophers and moralists and poets, at the same time bringing to them my light, and reasoning with them in the spirit of Christ. That will be my work.

Now we have sayings to this effect: "He who would be greatest shall be least." You cannot call this a humbug, because it is the saying of our Saviour, "Whosoever would be chief among you, let him be your servant." These missionaries, kind, earnest, devoted as they are, do not know these things, and at once exclude everything bearing the name of Hindoo.

Then, again, I have great faith and hope in my work there, and I will fairly and frankly tell you some of those hopes. Being born a priest, acquainted with the language, prejudices and all the peculiarities of the country, I know that, by the providence of God, I shall be the best medium to effect his work; and I have, so far as I know of your faith—that is, Unitarian Christianity and Universalism—I have come to the conclusion that Unitarianism or Universalism (although I don't find much difference between them) is the only system or form of Christianity that will work wonders in India in converting the Hindoos. Now, one great difficulty with the orthodox missionaries is to hold up the Bible first as a purely, absolutely inspired book. Now, brethren, you have a little charity, and hear what I have to say in this regard. I see in the Old Testament a great many local things which have not a bit of inspiration in them; but it was only human selfishness or interest that prompted them to be written. How can you present them to those people as totally inspired? You cannot preach Christianity if you go with that spirit, that everything is inspired that is inside the Bible, and nothing outside is inspired. I am happy to see that our Unitarian friends have no superstitious reverence for the book, and that they do not repudiate other books. They believe and preach religious truths outside the Bible. One ancient poet says, "Where you find a jewel in the dirt, pick up the jewel, but reject the dirt." So it is when we see beautiful truth; even when it is surrounded with dirt, let us receive and not reject it, because there is a mixture of Hindooism in it.

I am not much acquainted with the peculiar doctrines of the church called the New-Jerusalem Church; but from what I do know, I think there must be difficulty in converting Hindoos to their faith. In India, you could not convert a high-caste Brahmin if you told him the whole Bible is infallible. It troubles me to hear clergymen say, "This Bible has a great many local matters, as you say; but our teacher, Emmanuel Swedenborg, teaches us to receive the internal meaning, the spiritual meaning. They have some hidden truth; and we ought to take the internal, hidden truth, and make battle with the hidden infirmities." I believe that is an admirable process; but why not take the internal meaning of the battle of Waterloo or the American Revolution? They are not inspired. But now it is a poor way to say that the whole of God's truth is confined to this book. Judea was a small place, not larger than Massachusetts, perhaps; and if the infinite God, who fills the whole universe, had confined his revelation to that small part, it would be a wonderful thing.

Then, again, the missionaries go with some other things, as our friend Dr. Ellis has beautifully said—with their peculiar theology. Now, you can convert Hindoos to Christianity by shewing a Christian life, as our brother who gave me the charge so beautifully said. That is the best way to preach the Christian religion — to be a Christian. Instead of opening the New Testament all the time before the Hindoo, open your own heart, your feelings, your own lives, and let them read Christianity in them; and that is the best way to preach Christianity.

You have heard our friend say that I was forced to become a Deist. I was, indeed. And what drove me to it, do you think? It was not Christ who drove me to be a Deist. Now, leaving Hindooism, I came directly to Christ, to receive him as my guide to peace and immortality; and it was the missionary who drove me to the church of the Deists; it was not Christ. And what way? You are all aware that it was by preaching a manufactured theology which no human heart can ever master. You who are trained from your infancy under peculiar forms of faith, do not feel it; but I, being a priest, living a Hindoo life for so many years, and groaning under the yoke of superstition so many years—I feel it, and do not feel inclined to put that yoke upon my neck again. I do not feel inclined to put that yoke upon me, but to call upon that Teacher who stood upon the Mount of Olives, and said, "Come unto me, for my

yoke is easy, and my burden light." I do not wish to go back to India to put the yoke of orthodox theology on the necks of my fellow-countrymen.

Then, again, is it possible, in the name of religion, to call a man totally depraved? If I should teach that doctrine, my mother would say, "Joguth, am I totally depraved?" And so it would be with every Hindoo; they would stand surprised that any one could say so. Now, you know that an image of something must contain a similarity to the original. If you draw a picture of that organ, you cannot make it triangular or square; you must make it oblong, like the thing itself. Now, God, who is perfect love, wisdom and holiness, created man in his own image; how, then, could that image be "totally depraved"? It is theology that makes man totally depraved, not God. God is absolutely pure and holy, and man, his child, cannot be absolutely depraved.

Then, there is another thing which is a great mystery to a Hindoo—the idea of hell. I could not live three months, believing that I was going to an eternal hell. That is an absurdity which no man ought to believe. We ought to take care of the little hells before us in our streets and in our parlours. And so in India I do not expect to save so many converts from going to hell, as the orthodox tell us their missionaries do; but I am going to try to drag my brothers and sisters from the little hells, from the grog-shops, and other places—those little, cunning hells; and if you can save men from them, you can save them from the eternal hell, if there is any.

Now, if there is anything called heresy, I freely say that it is the belief that God punishes men eternally. Certainly, I never knew any heresy so bold as this. God, who is a God of love and mercy, a Father, to punish his children eternally, and not for their sins, but because he made them incapable of becoming better! Now, when your children grow wicked, and bring disgrace and shame and ridicule upon your family, you send them to Deer Island, or the Reform School, but not for ever. Your heart's affections and prayers go out after them, and the moment you are told by their teachers, "Your sons are doing well," you go after them in a carriage, if you are able, or on foot, and bring them home. That is the truth that was taught by Christ in the parable of the "Prodigal Son." So, friends, I am glad that the Liberal Christians have no such punishment as being punished eternally, and certainly I am very much glad.

Once more I speak a few words, as this will be the last time. I wish to speak open-mouthed before you. I am going to join my friend and pastor, Rev. Mr. Dall, in Calcutta, and work with him as a fellow-servant in Christ, helping him in any way I can. I was trained in India; I know the language, and I will try to translate your Unitarian literature into our language, and shew the beautiful translations to my countrymen; and this will be a great service. And then, with regard to my reception and living in India. I do not wish to live with Mr. Dall, unless I am forced by poverty or other circumstances to do it. That would injure my missionary influence, because the Hindoos say that the converts become Christians simply to eat beef and drink wine with Christian people. I will falsify that idea by going to live among Hindoos, and shew by my daily life what Christianity can make of a Hindoo. I am going among them, and my place will be to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ. I am going among them as a little leaven which, in God's own time, shall leaven the whole lump. I say I shall not live with Mr. Dall in Calcutta; for if I did, when my friends came there, notwithstanding all their affection for me, they would not come to see me, for they have prejudices against entering the house of a foreigner, and thus I should lose a great advantage.

Now, friends, it is a great advantage to send out a native missionary, letting him go to his countrymen, and preach Christianity in his own way. It is the business of the foreign missionaries to live in Calcutta, among their own people, who can speak their own language. So I go away among the Hindoos, who speak my language, to preach Christ, as a lamb among wolves. But, my friends, the spirit of Christ, the spirit of love, depend upon it, will be my guide.

And in conclusion, I say that my visit in this country has been very much satisfactory indeed. I have spent two years here, which have been the best and happiest of my life, and I go home with cheerfulness to my work; and I have but one word to say—that you who send armies to the battle-field ought to send ammunition and help wherever there is need. You who stay in the camp, do not sit at your table and calculate how much it costs, but give us everything we want. Do not judge by results. Let us do our part, and "He who seeth in secret shall reward us openly." Let us trust the results in India to God, and let us work faithfully, and devote all our time, and energy, and means to the service of God.

ABDOOL MASIH, THE PERSIAN MUSSULMAN CONVERTED TO UNITARIAN CHRISTIANITY.

It is a remarkable circumstance that we may immediately anticipate a second oriental visitor in the person of Abdool Masih.

We take the following particulars of him from a letter from Mr. Dall, of Calcutta, dated March 8, 1860, and printed in the Monthly Journal of the American Unitarian Association.

"The topic of most interest to us just now is the presence with us, for a month, of Capt. Edward Smyth Mercer, and his able catechist, or preacher, Abdool Masih. In our last printed Report (the Eighth), you see something of the doings of this man Abdool, —a Persian Mussulman by birth, and baptized into Christianity ten years ago. From his own lips, I gather that, in May coming, it will be twenty-five years since he was born at the capital city of Teheran, Persia. His parents still live there; and his father is a wealthy merchant of shawls. His attention was first attracted towards Christianity by his meeting in Persia with Dr. Pfander's Persian translation of an English book ('The Very Truth').

"Abdool first went over the Himalaya from Teheran to Herat and Peshawur, which is at the extreme north-western point of British India, at twelve years of age. He at that time accompanied his uncle Amoo, in a caravan of five or six hundred men and five thousand camels, to sell woollen cloths and valuable shawls. He made so good a 'spec' at Herat with the five camel-loads which uncle Amoo had given him to sell, that he got high praise on his return to Teheran. His travels had excited in him a curious and inquiring spirit, even before Hadjah Karapiet, an Armenian Christian gentleman who lived near his father's, gave him to read some Protestant Christian tracts. It was not long before he took another southward journey through the splendid sublimities of the mountains (the north-western spurs of the Himalayas, called on the maps the Indian Caucasus, a little north-west of Cashmere), reading and thinking all along the road. At the town of Herat, set in a magnificent valley, and considered to be the key of India's power in that direction, Abdool resided a year. At this time, his spirit of inquiry was quickened not a little by his mother's brother, who lived not very far away, at Bokhara. Abdool, then only fourteen, was already a merchant, and making money. Ere long, his father wrote to him to come home to Teheran, and be married. In no special hurry to be wedded, Abdool wrote, 'Expect me back, father, in five or six months.' He presently left Herat for Candabar, in Persia; rested there a fortnight; and then went down south, *viâ* Cabool, to Peshawur. There the arms of the gospel embraced him so tightly and lovingly, that he could not get away.

"At Peshawur, forsaking his father's wealth and the offered Persian bride, he was baptized into the Father, Son and Spirit, when about fifteen years old; that is, about ten years ago. The English branch of the Holy Church had put the water on his head, and for four years he remained happy in her bosom.

"But, troubled by the Athanasian Creed and by other things in the Prayer-book, he then felt obliged to step beyond her paling: and so he connected himself with the mission of the American Presbyterians, under the chief pastoral guidance of the Rev. J. H. Morrison: and two and a half years ago, he found a still greater 'simplicity in Christ;' and, as instructed by Capt. Edward S. Mercer, he became a Unitarian Christian. For seven or eight years he has been preaching Christian truth; and for the last two or more, Unitarian Christian truth. He is now spending a few weeks in Calcutta, on his way to England under the eye of Capt. Mercer, who is bound for the old country on 'sick-leave,' and expects to be there between one and two years, taking Abdool, his wife and baby, to his (Capt. Mercer's) mother's at Bath.

"Or, if the Calcutta fund opens wide enough to him, he will give Abdool that English drill which he greatly needs. Capt. Mercer seems a clear-headed and determined, as well as a warm-hearted and devout man; and he has been greatly cheered by what he regards as the success of sending one Asiatic convert to New England, and hopes that, in Old England, another will meet with as generous a welcome. He would give a good deal to secure, to Abdool, Philip Joguth's command of English. Language is the *forte* of the Brahmin, and especially of the Bengalee Brahmin."

AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

The thirty-fifth anniversary of the Association was celebrated in the church in Hollis Street, Boston, on Tuesday, May 29, 1860. Rev. Dr. Hedge, of Brookline, presided on the occasion. After a voluntary on the organ, the congregation united in singing a hymn. Rev. Samuel J. May, of Syracuse, then offered a fervent prayer, in which he alluded to the recent death of

Rev. Theodore Parker, and besought that his surviving brethren might imitate him in his constant search for truth, the consecration of his abilities to its diffusion, and his unwearied labours in behalf of suffering humanity.

Rev. James F. Clarke, the Secretary of the Association, read an abstract of the annual report of the Executive Committee, from which we make a few extracts.

"Our 'Quarterly Journal' has been changed to a 'Monthly.' It is intended to be a strictly denominational work, and it is on that account only that we can ask our parishes to subscribe for it. There seems to be a place for such a periodical—one into which all that concerns the Unitarian body shall be deposited. We do not wish it to contain much literary or miscellaneous matter; not to contain anything, in fact, which could as well be printed elsewhere.

"We have this year adopted, to some extent, a plan, which might be carried yet further, of requesting some of our settled ministers to act as local missionaries in their own region of country. We have, for example, voted a certain sum to Dr. Sheldon at Bath, and to Mr. Fish in Central New York, asking them to supply their pulpits during a certain number of Sundays in the year, and to do missionary work in their own neighbourhoods. Mr. Forman, at Alton, has been doing for us a like kind of work in his region. Mr. Conant at Rockford, Ill., and Mr. Brown at Lawrence, K.T., have been employed to a less extent in the same way. This method seems preferable to that of employing a single missionary, at a large salary, to give all his time to the work. Instead of having one man with a salary of two thousand dollars, we can have twenty men at a hundred. We thus save the time and expense required for travelling from one part of the country to another; for our twenty men are close to the place where the work is to be done. Moreover, they can choose the most suitable time for visiting a place; they can keep up a communication with it afterward; and also we thus have twenty men instead of one to take an interest in our missionary activity. For such reasons as these, this plan seems worthy of further trial.

"Another plan, which we have just commenced, and as yet only partially acted upon, is that of furnishing books and tracts gratuitously to Unitarian circles in those places where there is no Unitarian church. The condition is that they shall meet together, and read the books, sermons, &c., and hold religious services among themselves. Such circles may make the nucleus of a religious society, unite together the Liberal Christians in a community, and be quite as useful, perhaps, as a more regular church. It is, in fact, a primitive Christian church which we propose to establish,—a church of the two or three meeting together in the name of Christ. Ten or twelve men and women can meet together every Sunday; can sing and pray, and hear a good sermon, and converse about some religious subject; can agree to visit together the sick or poor: and so, without calling themselves a church or knowing that they are a church, they become, in reality, a very real and living church.

"Since the 1st of June, 1859, the Secretary has kept the records of the Association, written between four and five hundred letters on the business of the Association, edited the 'Monthly Journal," and preached in its behalf in thirty-eight churches. At nearly all of these places, the Secretary has preached distinctively in behalf of the Association and its mission, and taken up collections in many of them for this object. He has also been at the office almost every day, for an hour or two, to attend to the business which might arise there.

"Professor Huntington, whose position towards the denomination has for some time been indefinite, has during the year left the denomination, and entered the Episcopal Church. On the other hand, we have received into our denomination several ministers who have been previously connected with other sections of the church. These are Mr. Baldwin, of Fon du Lac, formerly a Trinitarian Congregationalist; Mr. Ames, of Bloomington, Ill., formerly a Free-will Baptist; Mr. Town, lately a member of the Theological School at New Haven; Mr. Calthrop, formerly of the Church of England; and Mr. Miller, formerly a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church. One or two more have also joined us, or are about to join us.

"We have also, during the year, aided in the formation of new societies in Bloomington, Ill.; in Fon du Lac, Wis.; in Braintree and Randolph, Mass.; and one or two others. These societies are not always—nor, in the West, usually—called Unitarian: they are composed of Liberal men and women, to whom the word 'Unitarian' is often quite unknown. They contain Unitarians, Universalists, Quakers, and men from all churches: they are variously named the Free Church, the Independent Church, or the Christian Church. But these churches are virtually with us; and it would be a very narrow policy which should require that they should adopt our name before receiving our sympathy and aid. They are most of them hardly organ-

ized, and are in an infant state; but each of them seems a genuine growth, and meets a real want of many earnest men and women.

"The object of the Association is to furnish a centre of unity and activity to the denomination; to offer an instrument for missionary work; to be the agent through which the churches can communicate with each other and with the world. It is the only medium we possess for this co-operation. If we do not unite together and act together through *this* organization, we shall not unite together or act together in any way. Now, individualism is a good thing; but co-operation is a good thing also. Freedom is essential to Christian life and progress; but union is no less essential.

"The problem which all churches are trying to solve is, how to have freedom, and not lose union; how to have union, and not lose freedom. Most churches fail in one direction: we fail in the opposite. They sacrifice freedom for the sake of union: we sacrifice union for the sake of freedom. They, therefore, accomplish more in moulding great masses: we do more for the development of individuals. But the rule, 'This ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone,' is always applicable. One-sided and unbalanced activities never produce a fulness of life: they leave meagreness, thinness and leanness in soul and body. The rule should be, to supply by effort where the tendency is wanting. Our tendency fails on the side of co-operation; and it is there that our effort should be directed.

"Now co-operation with us cannot be based on unity of doctrine or of form. In doctrine we must be always free, and never can be otherwise. We can unite in no creed as our bond of union: all attempts to do this must prove wholly futile. Nor can we unite in any form, whether it be liturgy, ceremony, ritual or hymn-book. In these respects, each church must develop its own life freely in its own way.

"But if our union is not to be found in doctrine or ceremony, it can only be found in action. We can co-operate in work, and in work alone; and as the Unitarian Association is the only medium of work which we have, we must either co-operate through this or not at all."

OBITUARY.

June 8, in the 23rd year of her age, SARAH JANE, the beloved wife of Henry PAYTON, of Birmingham; and on July 13, their child, HENRY TWIST PAYTON, aged six weeks. She had been for several years a consistent teacher in the Sunday-school, and was a valued member of the Unitarian church, Newhall Hill.

June 12, aged 78, at Newport, Isle of Wight, JOHN REAVER MORRIS. His career, which was that of a prosperous tradesman, did not present any striking incident, but his honour as a merchant, his virtues in private life, and his humble and unaffected piety as a Christian, won the respect of all who knew him. He was a firm friend of civil and religious liberty, and a sincere member of the Unitarian church at Newport. After his retirement from business in London, and especially during his residence in the Isle of Wight, reading was his chief occupation and amusement. He loved biography, and had an almost inexhaustible fund of anecdote. He lived much in his own world of meditation, yet he was friendly, social and habitually cheerful. He bore his last illness with the greatest patience and resignation. As he approached the spirit-land he felt more and more the need of Divine aid. He prayed for fuller communion with our Heavenly Father, in whose goodness and mercy he rejoiced and trusted, and spoke of the holy Saviour, "whom having not seen he loved," as having "gone before to prepare a place" for him. Hence death came to him not as a fell destroyer, but a good angel. He had wisely set his house in order, and worldly anxieties did not trouble him in his last moments.

July 10, at his residence, 27, St. Mary's Road, Canonbury Square, in his 79th year, WILLIAM STEVENS, Esq., thirty-five years a member of the Court of Common Council for, and twenty-three years Deputy of, the ward of Bishopsgate Within.